NIEMAN REPORTS

Vol. XL, No. 4, Winter 1986

Bernard Ingham, press secretary to Margaret Thatcher, reflects on the current condition of the British media.

Publisher of Nicaragua's *La Prensa* accepts Lyons Award for conscience and integrity in journalism.

CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT: A heartfelt cry from a visitor to South Africa.

David Lamb ponders the Code of Justice in Saudi Arabia.

Воокѕ

ALICE BONNER on the White Press and Black America.

DIANA DANIELS and JOHN KUHNS review works on libel and the media.

JACK FOISIE on Ernie Pyle's innovative journalism.

JOHN KATZENBACH on the novelist lurking in every reporter.

IAN MENZIES on the meanderings of the Charles River.

JOHN WHEELER on three remarkable gentlemen of Japan.

Between the Lines



ust as beauty lies in the eye of the beholder, truth is subject to interpretation. No longer is it an absolute. Should there be any doubt of this, public reaction to the recent spate of misinformation is proof that the majority of citizens want rocksolid surety in their news. They do not approve of their government playing games with facts.

In October when the press revealed the government's disinformation program, the public outcry was immediate and strong. Among the actions taken: The American Society of Newspaper Editors condemned what it said was the deliberate government use of false information. In a telegram to President Reagan, the group said, "The Society expresses outrage and alarm at any such effort to manipulate public opinion. This calculated technique of falsehood, commonly employed by totalitarian governments as an instrument of policy, is repugnant to American democratic principles and destructive of the role of the press in a free society."

In another development, assistant secretary of state for public affairs Bernard Kalb resigned in protest.

The clamor for truthfulness is paramount.

Four times a year, *Nieman Reports* strives to bring truths to its readers.

In this issue, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's press secretary looks British journalism full in the face; Bernard Ingham finds the press in disarray.

The Louis M. Lyons Award "for conscience and integrity in jour-

nalism" is another facet of truth. Violeta Chamorro, recipient of the 1986 Lyons Award and the publisher of Nicaragua's *La Prensa*, is in vivid pursuit of truth. After her husband's assassination, when he was editor of *La Prensa*, she has continued the struggle for press freedom. Because the government has closed down publication of the newspaper, she has had to move her efforts into the arena of public opinion.

David Lamb describes the reality of Saudi Arabia's penal code, a system that perpetuates that country's view of truth in word and deed.

Charlayne Hunter-Gault, moving among the people of South Africa, experiences the trauma of knowing men, women, and children whose scars bear witness to the repression in that violently torn nation.

Acts of terrorism are not new. Michael Kirkhorn cites reporters of the 1920's and 1930's who traveled overseas and worked under the storm clouds of unrest and revolution. Some foresaw the cataclysmic events that would lead to World War II. Some journalists, in fact, were so impassioned by the plight of the beleagured that they stayed to join forces with them.

Today's climate is riddled with uncertainties which render the reporting of news particularly vulnerable to inaccuracies. In an attempt to ensure correct newsgathering, the networks have issued guidelines for employees covering civil unrest, hostage situations, or terrorist activities. Copies of memoranda from ABC, CBS, and NBC are included in these pages. Their explicit instructions, conscientiously carried out, can provide the public

with precise news.

In The Netherlands a gentler confrontation is taking place while the Dutch government weighs the pros and cons of commercial television or a nonprofit operation. In any event, their unique broadcasting system will undergo change.

The seven book reviews that complete the magazine contents embody other truths: the continuing imbalance of the black and the white press at work in America's newsrooms; the proliferation of libel cases against the media; glimpses of the past through World War II dispatches from a world-famous correspondent; portraits of some remarkable Japanese relatives; the meandering pattern of a Massachusetts river; and, finally, a peek at the novelist hidden within almost every reporter.

Bronson Alcott, a nineteenth century American transcendentalist, writer, and teacher, wrote: "The deepest truths are best read between the lines, and, for the most part, refuse to be written."

Alcott's statement is in direct contrast to the ongoing efforts of those who, time and again, attempt to capture the essence of truth, using all methods of communication, whether as time-honored as pen to paper or as contemporary as electronic transmission of words and images. Persistence, then, may be a key to open truth's door.

T.B.K.L.

Nieman Reports

Vol. XL, No. 4 Winter 1986

Publisher HOWARD SIMONS

Editor TENNEY BARBARA K. LEHMAN

Consulting Editor (This issue) FAY LEVIERO

Editorial Assistant ELIZABETH TIBBITTS

Business Manager KETTEE J. BOLING

Nieman Reports (USPS #340-650) is published quarterly by the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. Copyright ©1986 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Subscription \$15.00 a year; add \$10.00 for foreign air mail. Single copies \$4.00. Back copies are available from the Nieman Office.

Please address all subscription correspondence and change of address information to P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108.

Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts, and additional entries. Postmaster: Send form 3579 to P.O. Box 4951, Manchester, NH 03108.

CONTENTS

2 Between the Lines

Tenney B.K. Lehman

- 4 **The Temper of the British Press** Bernard Ingham Interpretation may lead to livelier stories but the facts can be wrong.
- 8 La Prensa: A Barometer of Freedom Violeta Chamorro
 The publisher defends her award-winning newspaper's stand against government repression.
- 13 An Arab Code of Justice David Lamb

 Is the reason for an almost crime-free Saudi Society related
 to the Sharia or to Arabian faith and culture?
- On Eloquence and Courage in South Africa Charlayne Hunter-Gault A heartfelt cry from a visiting journalist.
- 16 **Terrorism and Propaganda** Michael Kirkhorn A look back at terrorism and reporters covering wars during the 1920's and 1930's.
- 20 **Broadcast Guidelines for Covering Crises**Reporters are not participants; they should obey bona fide orders and be accurate.
- 25 **Broadcasting Issues in The Netherlands** Yvonne van der Heijden
 The non-commercial system shakes on its foundations.
- 30 Books

The White Press and Black America by Carolyn Martindale

Alice Bonner

The Journalist's Handbook on Libel and Privacy by Barbara Dill Diana M. Daniels

Suing the Press: Libel, the Media, and Power by Rodney A. Smolla John B. Kuhns

Ernie's War: The Best of Ernie Pyle's World War II
Dispatches. Edited with a biographical essay
by David Nichols
Jack Foisie

Samurai and Silk: The Individual and Japan's Modernization by Haru M. Reischauer John Wheeler

The Charles. The People's River by Max Hall Ian Menzies

Acquainted With the Night: The Image of Journalists in American Fiction, 1890-1930

by Howard Good John Katzenbach

44 Nieman Notes

The Temper of the British Press

Bernard Ingham

When all is not well with journalism.

come to the Nieman Foundation carrying two health warnings: First, anyone emanating from Downing Street should perhaps be careful at Harvard. George Downing, your second graduate, became Cromwell's master spy; an M.P., and "a very voluminous speaker" at that; a blackmailer; the very first jerry builder with Downing Street, some would say, a prime example of his work; and was incarcerated in the Tower of London for his double dealings. Not, I imagine, Harvard's favorite son.

Second, a book published in London this week by Jim Prior, ex-Secretary for Employment and then for Northern Ireland in Mrs. Thatcher's Governments, says this of me: "He certainly did not qualify as as intellectual — he was more in the mold of a political bruiser." I like his use of the past tense but you may well come to think he is right.

I should add that I am a civil servant who has seved both Labor and Conservative Governments over the

Bernard Ingham has been press secretary to Margaret Thatcher since 1979. He started his career as a journalist for the Yorkshire Post



and The Guardian; he has served in both the Left and Right British Governments. He delivered the above talk in October at Lippmann House when he met with the Nieman Fellows.

last nineteen years. Among those I have served on the Left are Barbara Castle and Anthony Wedgewood Benn. From this you may conclude that the Vicar of Bray was nobbut (which translated from broad Yorkshire into plain English means "only") a novice. Alternatively, I hope you might describe me as a pro.

What I want to do today is to reflect on the current condition of the British media, which has not improved in recent years and, perhaps through these English eyes, help you to think more critically, and conceivably better, of the American journalist.

Let me say at the outset that I have a high opinion of members of the Association of American Correspondents in London whom I see every Wednesday. They are not, of course, players in our political process, and that may account for some of the difference of approach. But they do seem genuinely to be concerned to understand and explore and elicit rather than to score points.

But back to Britain.

I will kick off with a couple of quotes by British journalists:

Brian Walden, ex-Labor M.P. and until recently presenter of London Weekend Television's political program Weekend World:

"I can tell of a generation of journalists who have Watergate on the brain and think they could be Carl Bernstein if only they were encouraged to betray every confidence, violate everybody's privacy, and read every top secret document."

(Sunday Times, 29 September 1986). John Pilger, editorial director of a projected new Left-wing paper, News on Sunday, who would die were he to hear that I was quoting him:

"The difference that will distinguish it (his new journal) from its competitors is a principle in its editorial charter: that news always must be separate from comment."

(U.K. Press Gazette, 25 August 1986).

One final quote:

Princess Anne, practising the art of dontopedology, as she put it — or the art of opening your mouth and putting your foot in it:

"Suffice it to say that on a personal level this summer, I suffered severe aggravation from the amount of unadulterated trivia, rubbish, and gratuitous troublemaking that appeared in all sections of the media in response to a perfectly normal family occasion."

(Associated Press, London, 17 September 1986).

Please note, all sections of the media.

I have gone to the trouble of this modest research to make the point that I am not the only one critical of the British media after seven years as Mrs. Thatcher's Press Secretary. And while, for the purposes of this talk, I may appear to concentrate on newspapers, I in no way exonerate radio and television. The latter is particularly ripe for a critique and one day I shall get round to it.

So the first point to register is that all is not well with British journalism by the acknowledgment of those in the profession itself. This week, however — on Tuesday, in fact, a new broadsheet newspaper was launched in London. To judge from its pre-publicity, it intends to improve things.

Peregrine Worsthorne, editor of *The Sunday Telegraph*, remains to be convinced this is possible. Writing in the *Spectator* last March he asked two questions:

"Are there enough journalists around in Britain today to staff a genuinely high quality newspaper? And are there enough readers who want such a product?" He suspended judgment on the first, though I do believe that *The Independent* has got together a quality staff.

Worsthorne did, however, seem to think that the market existed: "When Cecil King took the Daily Mirror up market in the 1960's he left a lot of dissatisfied morons at the bottom thereby allowing Mr. Murdoch to undercut The Mirror with The Sun. Now Mr. Murdoch has taken The Times down market leaving a lot of dissatisfied mandarin readers at the top."

Mr. Prior would have no hesitation in identifying Mr. Worsthorne as an intellectual, though he is perhaps a trifle grand to be a fully paid up mandarin. So what kind of daily newspaper does Mr. Worsthorne want *The Independent* to be?

I retail his prescription because it is all too revealing about contemporary British journalism. He argues: "... Readers would look to it for the truth, not through the devious and intellectually corrupt methods of investigative reporting but through the editorial application of sound judgment, deep historical knowledge, and passionate integrity... Nothing would be excluded on principle, except ignorance, vulgarity, and malice — i.e., most gossip columns."

The Independent is not the first new national newspaper — i.e., covering the whole of the U.K. — to appear this year. The tabloid *Today* was launched in March — before it was properly geared up, to judge from its editor's remarks — and has had to be rescued from deep trouble by Lonrho, which has the Sunday Observer. My friend Brian MacArthur, Today's editor, recently said: "We hadn't produced one complete newspaper (in advance of launch). We had been frustrated by very poor electrical installation which left our building live and the walls red hot. The air conditioning and the Hastech system were both working on the same line."

The Sunday Sport was also launched last month — "a voyeuristic, smutty scandal sheet" according to the U.K. Press Gazette, the trade journal.

Other new national newspapers are either a gleam in a publisher's eye, in process of gestation like Mr. Pilger's, or even on their way to the labor ward. This rush into print stems from three things:

First, the labor legislation introduced by Mrs. Thatcher's Governments (and in part by Mr. Prior) to cut back the power of the unions and so enable new technology — or more properly relatively old technology involving computers — to be applied

and transferring production to a new plant in deepest London dockland away from Fleet Street.

The result is the prospect of many more national newspapers catering for minority tastes — minority tastes which, I hope, may include accuracy, fairness, and balance — and profitable at much lower levels of circulation.

This explains the current interest in *The Independent* which apparently intends to be rigorously so, even to the extent of turning down all "freebies" — facility trips at someone else's expense. It aims at 365,000 readers after two years to be a commercial success. *The Times* and *The Guardian* have struggled in the past to make a profit on sales of around 500,000.

A number of journalists in Britain are concerned about the state of journalism and very much want to see standards improve. What then worries them? Well, I have identified five diseases:

The Le Carré syndrome — manifested by a conviction that Government is essentially, chronically, and irrevocably up to no good, not to be trusted and conspiratorial. This so distorts a

It's elementary; never go for the simple explanation when an elaborate theory can be constructed. After all, it reads better.

to newspaper production and, no less important, to facilitate flexibility in their distribution;

Second, the successful battle which Eddie Shah, founder of Today, fought in the provinces to break the power of the print unions;

Third, the action of Mr. Rupert Murdoch in sacking his entire print staff of 5,500, or so, employed on four national daily and Sunday newspapers

journalist's approach and judgment as to render him unreliable.

The Conan Doyle complication — this carries Holmesian deduction to heroic excess so that 2 and 2 becomes 22 because there must be a catch in 4. It's elementary, my dear Watson, never go for the simple explanation when an elaborate theory can be constructed. After all, it reads better.

Columnar pox — a social contagion particularly affecting diarists and gossip columnists and arising from intercourse with what Alan Watkins, political columnist on the Observer, would call the chattering classes.

The Coleman or Carpenter phenomenon — with my profound apologies to these blameless BBC sports commentators. This is the condition which produces in reporters an inability to report just the facts; only their own commentary on those facts will do. This interruption usually makes for a better story when the Le Carre, Conan Doyle, and Columnar viruses are already at work in the journalistic bloodstream.

Journalists are as gregarious as deer.

Separatitis — nothing to do with Greta Garbo's wanting to be alone. After all, journalists are as gregarious as deer. It has everything to do with the belief among far too many journalists that they somehow lead, and should develop a separate existence from the society in which they live; that whatever they do is sanctified by the blessed state of freedom which they enjoy, untrammelled by any thought for the consequences for their fellow man.

Let me now impart some form for these viruses.

Le Carre's conspiracy theory of Government absolves the journalist from checking: he just knows he is right. One result: a vivid front-page account of the expulsion through a British airport of a foreign national in handcuffs, supposedly screaming his way across the tarmac because of the fate that was said to await him at his destination in Eastern Europe. In fact, the man was put on a plane by a security firm who is not allowed to

lay a finger on a deportee; and his native country, far from wishing to do nasty things to him, simply refused to admit him.

Once in the cuttings, "news" hardens into history or legend. Sure enough, this unfortunate man reemerged several months later, hand-cuffed and screaming his way across the tarmac out of Britain.

As for creative deduction, the Conan Doyle complication, let us look no further than that unhappy day a year ago when a Jordanian/Palestinian delegate failed to meet the Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe. Fleet Street nearly had a stroke.

In its apoplectic fit, it accused the U.K. Government — or more specifically the F.C.O. — of anything from naïvete to one of the most damaging errors of judgment in recent British diplomacy. The country, we learned, had been duped and humiliated by this fiasco. In fact, as King Hussein soon confirmed on television, a Palestinian delegate found himself unable at the last minute to go along with a previously agreed statement.

It is a measure of the media's difficulty in accepting the simple explantion that *The Financial Times*, no less, found itself reluctant to countenance what it conceded was the most likely reason for the failure of the mission — a change of mind by a delegate. This is a classic case of a rush to judgment based less on the available facts than on the prevailing prejudice.

Malice, or columnar pox, in the British media comes in many forms and degrees. But bloodsport is brought to its ultimate refinement in the gossip columns — pop and quality; tabloid and broadsheet. Here, in my experience, the invariable rule is not to check, always to embroider, and consistently to get it wrong.

But it isn't only the gossip columns. Take this from a former political correspondent of *The Times*. His report identified Cabinet Ministers who "may be touched by scandal," according to a Commons' motion on Lloyds' Syndicates in the City of London. It failed to mention how they might be touched. But would the story have made the front page, or any other page, had the reader been informed that the likelihood was that those Ministers' pockets would be touched only to their financial loss?

The news reporter with the Coleman/Carpenter commentator disease produces some interesting stories. One of the most familiar, and lesser, examples is the way politicians are forever being portrayed as climbing down — e.g., when Mrs. Thatcher brought to an end a series of tit-for-tat diplomatic explusions following the disclosure of Gordievski's defection.

Certain actions are taken, certain statements made, certain policies or measures are introduced. Whether they represent a climb-down or a leg-up is a matter of interpretation; not a matter of fact. The BBC, no less, presents climb-down as fact.

A more serious example was the hullabaloo created by a reporter's expression of opinion on a lecture by the Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary in Houston, Texas, last October. When asked on British radio, "So it is your interpretation of what he said?", the Canadian reporter replied: "Some of it is, and some of it isn't."

The Kremlinological zeal with which all statements are analyzed these days is nothing as compared to the imagination brought to the interpretations put upon these analyses — and that takes us back to the Conan Doyle complication.

The urge to interpret can be — and is — variously explained by the commercial need to come up with a livelier rather than a duller story; by the problem of competing with the faster news dissemination of radio and television. What readers want from newspapers these days, having got the raw information from radio and television, is analysis; and by

the growth of specialists who are expected to be better informed on a particular topic than the general reporter.

The fact is, however, that the occupational hazard of the public figure in Britain today is not to be misreported; it is to be misrepresented by interpretation. You are justice provided by society?

The very idea that Parliament and elector are exercising control over the Executive, and not solely the journalist, has come as a flash of light, though not I fear Damascene, to students on media courses I have addressed. A free press is one of the checks and balances in our democra-

Independent Order of the White Knights of Veracity riding to his protection when he *eventually* finds the correction he has secured, and has brought his magnifying glass to bear on the 5-point in which it is printed. Sam Zagoria, [NF '55], who this

Sam Zagoria, [NF '55], who this year completed his stint as Ombudsman on *The Washington Post*, reported one of his "pet peeves" as being "*Post* corrections so brief they became breakfast-time key stories."

Newspaper ombudsmen are not much of a feature of British journalism.

What conviction can newspapers carry with their readers when they perceive such a growing gap between easy editorials in praise of all the virtues, and this reluctance to acknowledge an error on their part?

Another aspect of the truth to which newspapers say they are dedicated is the wholesomeness of the news product — natural or synthetic. There are, for example, crowds and Rentacrowd; quote and Rentaquote.

The temper of Britain is better than television viewers or readers of newspapers may imagine. When, for security reasons, Mrs. Thatcher goes unheralded on tour in Britain, she meets few demonstrators. Protestors need time to organize their bawling posses. When they fail to do so, with less than 24 hours' notice, journalists are struggling to find a story fit to print. An egg splattering across the P.M.'s car saves the day. No visit is complete without a free-range egg.

Do not assume when you read the British press on a Monday morning that a row is brewing in the House of Commons. The crop of blood-curdling weekend quotes has been assiduously cultivated by a journalist without regard to reality. Editors are not a demanding lot, even though impending row after impending row has melted like snow into sweetness and light in the oven of 24 hours.

There are also statements and statements and exclusives and exclusives. To the average reader, an unqualified statement is a positive,

continued to page 28

The occupational hazard of public figures in Britain today is not to be misreported; it is to be misrepresented by interpretation.

very lucky if your actual remarks are reported at all, let alone mentioned.

Separatitis raises the issue of the role of the journalist in society and his relationship with the community of which he forms a part. This summer a distinguished Fleet Street editor retired, and as he was a former Cabinet Minister, the Prime Minister gave him dinner. In his speech of thanks he expressed the hope that his peers would consider him to have been a citizen first and a journalist second. That, for me, sums up the unresolved problem.

How should a journalist relate to the community to which he belongs?

How long can a democracy remain healthy when its media presumes guilt among the governors?

For all its crises, my abiding impression of Government over the last nineteen years, across seven administrations involving five Prime Ministers, is sharply at variance with the unflattering, stereotyped approach to it of the many journalists upon whom the compulsion to get their facts right is infinitesimal compared with that on Ministers and officials.

How do we reconcile the concept of the journalist in his self-appointed role as public protector, pillory, and prosecutor with the official instruments of Parliament and a system of cy, but it is not the only one.

Commenting on the suspension of two BBC journalists after a certain investigation, one newspaper wrote: "Their methods may not come out of a school of journalism, but neither do good stories."

Already the Press Council, the public watchdog, has sanctioned the concept of "permissible subterfuge."

It may well be — I hope so — that the time is rapidly approaching, with the pronounced proliferation of titles, choice, and intensified media competition, when serious newspapers will have to pay serious attention to the kind of service they provide for their readers.

Real, live newspapers sell themselves among other things as purveyors of news, information, and enlightenment. The least, then, the consumer is entitled to expect is a reverence for fact and balance.

This reverence is greatest where the journalist is closest to his readers, whether they be of a local weekly or of a special interest journal. But it is not, I fear, greatly encouraged by many "high priests," otherwise known as editors. If it were, editors would not be as averse to publishing corrections as the teetotaler is to alcohol.

The offended reader does not immediately conjure up a vision of the

Louis M. Lyons Award

La Prensa: A Barometer of Freedom

Howard Simons/Violeta Chamorro

By vote of the Nieman Fellows, Class of 1986, the Louis M. Lyons Award for "conscience and integrity in journalism" was awarded to Violeta Chamorro, publisher of the Nicaraguan newspaper, *La Prensa*, that was shut down by the government last summer.

The award was presented to her at Lippmann House on September 18 at an informal gathering of Nieman Fellows, members of the alumni/ae and of the Harvard faculty, and friends of the Nieman Foundation. Mrs. Chamorro was joined by her 32-year-old daughter, Cristiana, who was in charge of the newspaper's editorial page.

Presentation of the award was made by Mark Ethridge 3rd, managing editor of *The Charlotte* (N.C.) *Observer* and chairman of the 1986 awards committee. He said that Mrs. Chamorro was selected because her 60-year-old family newspaper has been an objective voice in the war-torn country, resisting oppression "whether it comes from the right or left." He added, "It takes courage and integrity to do what Mrs. Chamorro has done. She has resisted repression and censorship from whichever corner it has come."

The following introductory remarks were given by Howard Simons, curator of the Nieman Foundation.

 $W_{\rm elcome!}$

The main purpose of tonight's gathering is to greet the new class of Nieman Fellows — the 49th class. It has all the promise of being a vintage class.

Tonight, too, we want to com-



Mark Ethridge 3rd, chairman of the 1986 awards committee, presents Violeta Chamorro with the Lyons Award.

memorate another Nieman event — the presentation of the Louis Lyons Award for "conscience and integrity" in journalism.

Louis Lyons was Nieman curator for twenty-five years, more than half the life of the program. Indeed, Louis gave life to the program. His memory, his conscience, and his integrity inspire us and sustain us still. And we miss him.

The Louis Lyons Award was established in 1964 — by Louis' last class. The award now is presented annually; the recipient is selected by the contemporary Nieman class; we promulgate its existence in ads; we actively solicit nominations; and we provide a monetary award.

These are parlous times for Nieman Fellows.

Zwelakhe Sisulu, Nieman Fellow '85, one of the rising stars of black South African journalism and its black future, was dragged from his bed and almost slain. After three weeks in detention and much protest from here and there, the South African government freed him.

A member of last year's class, who is here tonight, cannot go home. He is Roberto Eisenmann, publisher of Panama's *La Prensa*. According to friends and family, his return to Panama could mean death.

Three weeks ago Nicholas Daniloff, Nieman Class of 1974, was snatched by the KGB on a patently trumped up charge. To paint Nick with a spy brush is outrageous. He still is a prisoner in Soviet Russia. The KGB winds that have blown out of that dour country in the last two weeks have chilled all of us.

It is parlous times, too, for recent Louis Lyons Award winners.

Two years ago, the Nieman Class of 1984 selected Maria Olivia Mönckeberg of the Chilean magazine *Analisis*. It was closed last week by

Nieman Reports Photo by Jane Reed

the Pinochet government. One of Maria Olivia's colleagues, Jose Carrasco, was dragged from his bed and brutally slain by thugs.

A year ago, the Class of 1985 selected Allister Sparks of South Africa and a Nieman Fellow in the Class of '63, for the Lyons Award. This week, Allister told me that things never have been as bleak as they now are in his very bleak country.

Tonight, we honor Violeta Chamorro. Just as her Nicaragua is embattled, so is she and her now closed newspaper, *La Prensa*, silenced by the Sandinista government.

For some of us in the business, the murder of a newspaper or a radio station or a television station anywhere ought to be regarded as a death in the journalistic family everywhere.

Mrs. Chamorro's acceptance speech follows:

The day we were informed that Harvard University's Nieman Foundation had granted us the Louis M. Lyons Award for "conscience and integrity in journalism" was a day of happiness and of great emotion, not only for the staff of our newspaper, but also for most of our readers, who read the news in that afternoon's edition.

But the pride we felt at having received such a high honor was also a source of much reflection and questioning. We asked ourselves exactly what had been meant by "conscience and integrity in journalism" and why such a prestigious association had singled out *La Prensa* of Nicaragua, distinguishing us from so many other newspapers and journalists throughout the world.

We began to think back, to reflect upon the past, as well as the present, and we reached the conclusion that there cannot be "conscience" or "integrity" in the exercise of journalism unless there is also freedom of the press. Without a doubt, this award comes as a valuable stimulus to La

Prensa and all who work in it, as recognition of sixty years of struggle in behalf of freedom of expression, in adverse circumstances produced first by a right-wing dictatorship, and now by a leftist one.

Governments like that of Somoza and, today, that of the Sandinistas, have, unfortunately, forced such a position upon us as a painful duty. We have no choice but to defend freedom of the press as an inalienable human right, and to tirelessly defend it. History has taught us that freedom is not an abstract idea; rather, it is a reality we deal with every day. In order to preserve freedom where it already exists, and to win it where it does not, one must make a constant, militant effort.

And that is exactly what we have been, and are, at La Prensa: militant defenders of the freedom of the press and of freedom of information. We have defended these values against the regime which has tried to control us and make us blindly accept its ideological teachings and principles. Demanding this right has cost us blood, sweat, and tears. But we know that this is the price which must be paid to preserve, with con-



During a press conference at Lippmann House, Mrs. Chamorro discusses the Sandinista government's repression of her newspaper.

science and integrity, the great principles of democratic life.

Allow me, then, to use this freedom forum of Harvard University to speak specifically about my country and about *La Prensa*.

The case of *La Prensa* is a rather unique one in Latin America. When it has had a bit of freedom, it has raised the level of culture throughout the country. But for the most part, it has been subjected to censorship and to persecution, and has thus had to fight for its very existence.

La Prensa has chosen the road that is hardest for a newspaper to follow: it has wanted to be free, and to generate a true revolution of republican justice, pluralism, and democracy.

Throughout its history, La Prensa has been a bastion, a symbol of the struggle for the democratic and republican ideals of Nicaragua. We have always stood up to abuse of power, exile, calumny, and censorship, to the point of losing something extremely precious, the life of my husband, Pedro Joaquin Chamorro Cardenal. Because of all these circumstances, La Prensa forms part of the very history of Nicaragua, and has made an important contribution to Nicaragua's social development. In a word: La Prensa is held as a symbol, the barometer of freedom in Nicaragua.

The tragic assassination of my husband, editor of *La Prensa*, on January 10, 1978, was the event which touched off the revolution which overthrew Somoza as dictator.

Pedro's struggle, his political work, his thought, his daily writing in *La Prensa*, produced both the ideas and the heroism of the popular uprising which took place in Nicaragua in July, 1979. It was his example, his moral integrity, which prepared the way for this revolution, a revolution we had dreamed of, with justice and democracy, a revolution which we yearned for, in order to give Nicaragua the freedom which the dictatorship of Somoza had denied us for so many years.

In proof of the national recogni-

tion of my husband's long years of sacrifice, sealed in blood, I was called upon by the Sandinistas, in Costa Rica, in June, 1979, to form part of the new government.

I accepted because of my love for Nicaragua. For I was convinced that we must overthrow Somoza. They promised me that we would put forward a government program based on free elections, political pluralism, a mixed economy, non alignment, and full respect for human rights; all this, along with genuine, permanent freedom of the press.

I accepted, for I understood that the loss of Pedro had not only left me with great emotional emptiness, it also had made me responsible for carrying on with his ideals, his unfinished work, his desire to contribute to the restoration of democracy in Nicaragua.

Unfortunately, I fell into a Marxist-Leninist trap. I had believed that the new regime would signify government implantation of a new republic in Nicaragua - with laws dreamed of and written in blood. A republic in which all political parties had made an investment, not to mention the Nicaraguan people. We believed that this would be the first total revolution in Spanish America. A revolution which would advance toward justice, but without undermining liberty; would bring about social democracy, but without the loss of political democracy. What arose instead was an attitude of inhumanity. Once again we were confronted with militarism, once again with the absolutism of a hegemonic party. Now that party had a new banner and a new ideology, but it was the same "creole" dictatorship.

From the first day, June 19, 1979, I began to notice things which I had not imagined: attitudes which were very different from the ones to which we had committed ourselves.

I began to notice an excess of militarism, an exaggerated Cuban presence, scorn for democratic ideas and opinions, and disdain for all those who were not members of the Sandinista party.

From that first day I began to fight, from within the ruling *junta*, to keep the promise which we had made to all the democracies of Latin America and throughout the world which had helped us to overthrow Somoza. I fought in vain for nine months. And finally, I got them to accept my resignation, for I could not betray my conscience, nor the ideals which I had shared for twenty-seven years at Pedro's side.

We returned to obscurantist censorship, to the antidemocratic party favoritism which brooks no opposiwas because we had criticized some of their actions which had seemed to us to be totalitarian and suspicious.

On April 20, 1980, the day after they had accepted my resignation, they attempted to destroy La Prensa from within. They encouraged certain members of the workers union — members who obeyed them unconditionally — to take over the newspaper plant and turn us into a pro-Sandinista daily, with loss of our freedom from the regime. We managed to survive because of the solidarity forged between the owners of the company and some of

Once again we were confronted with militarism, once again with the absolutism of a hegemonic party.

tion. Once again, ideas were being censored. A revolution which had begun with the death of a free journalist ended up, only a short while after its triumph, with the worst censorship ever suffered by Nicaraguan journalism. This is an enormous contradiction, and it ought to open the eyes of all free men and women and all those of good will.

The censorship imposed by the Sandinistas has not been confined, as they allege, to those who interview them, or who interrogate them about this shameful problem. Nor was it brought about by the war, nor by the counterrevolution. This is false. It is historically false.

The censorship began in the first year, before the guerrilla warfare existed. It began slowly and secretly, and cleverly disguised, while we were still feeling the euphoria of the triumph of the revolution.

The commandants began to attack us in their political speeches, calling us "a newspaper that has betrayed its country," "reactionary," etc. This their workers, and the loyalty of the Nicaraguan people.

From this time on, the tactics used against the newspaper became more open: partial shutdowns and the intimidation, by means of threats and demonstrations, of the workers and owners of distribution agencies. Institutions controlled by the government were prohibited from running advertisements in La Prensa. Authorization was withheld for the spending of money abroad to import necessary raw materials. News material was censored, including news items published later by the official dailies. Publication of La Prensa became impossible, because of excessive censorship. The censors took unreasonable amounts of time - an average of five hours during the months of greatest harrassment - to review the material submitted to them.

The last step to make us disappear was taken on June 26 of this year, in the form of a three-line communique from the Department of Censorship of the Ministry of the Interior. I shall quote, word for word, this note, informing us of the decision of the Sandinista government to suspend publication indefinitely.

The note says: "Following instructions from above. I hereby notify you that, from today on, publication of the daily newspaper La Prensa is suspended indefinitely. Having nothing further to add at this moment I am, sincerely, Captain Nelba Cecilia Blandon."

of the United States Congress are those of a sovereign body, which attends, above all, to the vital interests of its own nation.

By means of its propaganda, which publicly accuses us of helping the enemies of Nicaragua, the Sandinista government has done something which is grotesquely illogical. For everyone knows that all the material published in La Prensa since 1982 was carefully inspected

We never have been given an official reason for the closing of La Prensa.

We never have been given an official reason for the closing of La Prensa, nor has the government ever conceded that we have a right to defend ourselves. The Sandinista press has continued to accuse us of being counterrevolutionaries, imperialists, and betrayers of our country, imprecise terms which we totally reject, as having been produced by political passion and the morbid hatred with which they have always attacked us, in the absence of serious arguments and documented charges.

Moreover, the Sandinista government used its best known militants to attempt to justify its actions. These arbitrary measures are in clear violation of human rights. They have based themselves on the decision of the United States Congress to grant humanitarian and military aid to the Nicaraguans who have risen in arms.

We believe that this attempt to tie the closing of La Prensa to the decision of the American Congress, is merely a pretext for establishing a totalitarian political system in Nicaragua, a system which clashes with the Western, Christian principles of the Nicaraguan people. Everyone knows that the decisions

and authorized by the Department of Censorship of the Ministry of the Interior.

The indefinite suspension of publications - "indefinite," like the previous period of brutal censorship to which the newspaper was subjected - violates the right to freedom of expression and of information guaranteed in article 19 of the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." It also violates article 13 of the American Convention on Human Rights (Pact of San Jose). All of these articles have been incorporated into the laws of Nicaragua.

The Sandinista government closed La Prensa without giving it the opportunity to present its case before an impartial tribunal. Nor did the Sandinista government ever prove its false accusation that La Prensa was financed by foreign governments and was attempting to sabotage the government of the Sandinista National Liberation Front.

Not only is this accusation a calumny, it is also illogical if we consider, as I said before, that all the material published by La Prensa was previously approved by the government, through the Department of Communication [Direccion de Medios de Comunicación], an office which forms part of the Ministry of the Interior.

By means of this violation of rights, which I am denouncing here, and which I have also denounced in letters to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, the Sandinista government has not only defiled Nicaragua'a national honor and betrayed the people, wounding them in their very heart, it also has violated the right to work of the 230 heads of family who were employed by La Prensa. This is an especially dramatic situation. For these people have been thrown out of work in a country where the government is the principle employer. And this makes it impossible for them to find new jobs and leaves them exposed to the worst, most miserable conditions my country has ever known.

I should add that all these measures have been accompanied by an ever more aggressive, ever more personal rhetoric, directed by the Sandinista rulers against the owners of La Prensa.

On July 19, 1986, in his official speech commemorating the anniversary of the Sandinista victory, a speech delivered before an estimated ten thousand people and broadcast, obligatorily, over radio and television to the entire country, Revolutionary Commandant Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic, accused me personally, and my relatives, the mother, brothers, and brother-in-law of my husband, as owners of La Prensa, of being "delinquents." He said that we deserved, or had deserved, to be brought before the "People's Anti-Somoza Tribunals, so that they can be condemned to thirty years of prison." This is the prison term which the President believes should be applied to us for having betrayed the country.

I should tell you that I was not surprised by those words. I have grown accustomed to hearing Ortega; accustomed to his confusing, contradictory, and overemotional way of expressing himself: a manner of speech which is inappropriate to the stature and the dignity expected of a head of state.

I answered Ortega in an open letter, in which I told him, among other things: "I submit to my captors with pleasure, so that they can apply the jail sentence you have threatened me with. I would thus follow the example of my husband who used to say that the dictatorship which existed before this one, that of Somoza, had only one prescription for everything: imprisonment."

I also heard Oretga say in his speech that he was not averse to the idea of doing to us what the Americans had done with citizens of Japanese origin during the Second World War - create concentration camps for suspicious elements.

I replied that the Commandant would need no such camps; given the laws, controls, repression, and suppression of all opinion contrary to that of his own Sandinista party, he had already created one vast concentration camp - Nicaragua itself. "But we Nicaraguans have not lost our spirit of liberty, and will never do so - not in the worst of the gulags Oretga has been able to imagine."

These threats against our freedom and personal security, threats which we know can be carried out at any moment, have also been accompanied by the sadly famous "turbas" of Nicaragua.

On Wednesday, August 6, 1986, a demonstration of Sandinistas, organized by the Sandinista Workers Union (CST), took place in front of our newspaper. The mob threw stones, shouted insults, painted slogans on the walls, burned the flags of Nicaragua and of La Prensa, and asked for the facilities to be confiscated. This makes us suspect that the FSLN is preparing the terrain to justify its next step: to take from us the physical plant and our other resources.

This action would hold grave consequences for the Nicaraguan people. The Sandinistas would thus steal the name of La Prensa, reopen it under their own editorship, and [make a mockery of] a long history of sacrifice and bloodshed on behalf of liberty and democracy in Nicaragua. In this way they would subjugate the thought of an entire nation to the Communism of the Sandinista National Liberation Front.

We always said that the day La Prensa was suppressed would mean the last gasp of freedom in Nicaragua.

belonging to all Nicaraguans, and not the patrimony of their government.

Our obligation and our right is to demand freedom of the press in Nicaragua, and with it, the reopening of La Prensa, without privileges and without censorship.

We draw our force from the support, stimulus, and recognition we receive from all our readers and from unbiased international opinion. We

We always said that the day La Prensa was suppressed would mean the last gasp of freedom in Nicaragua.

After seven years, the Sandinista government can boast of having silenced all voices opposed to its dictatorship. First to fall were the radio and television stations, later the Church radio, and, after four and a half years of brutal control over free thought in Nicaragua, free thought which was expressed with great difficulty in La Prensa, our newspaper lived its final hour.

When the government closed this last redoubt of civil opposition in Nicaragua, this last means of defending the rights of Nicaraguan citizens, rights trampled upon first by Somoza and then by the Sandinistas, it became clear that the Sandinistas would opt for military solutions, although they preach the opposite.

Measures such as the closing of La Prensa have shown the world the falseness of the supposed attitude of peace that the FSLN has tried to present to negotiating groups in Nicaragua. For this reason, we do not believe in any proposals for negotiation that come from the government.

Deeds speak louder than words. We have not, cannot, and will not negotiate about the freedom of Nicaraguan people, for it is a right will go on denouncing abuses and defending the weak and the victims of persecution, in order to fill the void left by the voices of those who have been silenced.

We have said this frequently in the past, and I want to repeat it here today: La Prensa does not favor the renewal of a futile and destructive civil war, but neither are we ready to allow a Marxist-Leninist system to enthrone itself in our country. That is the goal of the Sandinistas.

We are for peace, for negotiation, for dialogue. We are worried that Latin America is not accepting its responsibility and has avoided facing up to the danger that a leftist dictatorship means for Nicaragua and Central America. We had believed that the Contadora group could fulfill a historical role, but after fruitless years of vagueness and imprecision, Contadora has not produced the document we were hoping for, and which would lead to the democratization of Nicaragua.

My friends, I am sorry if I have taken too much of your time, but I could not resist the temptation to say here, in this free forum, what

continued to page 47

An Arab Code of Justice

David Lamb

Saudi Arabia is the only Arab country that implements the Sharia in its entirety.

t high noon one November day in 1983, as thousands of worshippers ended their prayers and poured out of Jamia Mosque in the Saudi Arabian city of Riyadh, a black police van carrying a man and a woman drove into the empty parking lot outside and stopped next to a piece of cardboard that had been placed on the pavement.

Ali Fakieh and Mouvira Sabie stepped from the van, blindfolded and with their arms bound behind them. They walked on wobbly legs toward the piece of cardboard and the man who waited there — a muscular former slave of Ethiopian descent who carried a three-footlong, double-edged sword. He would earn about \$350 that day for severing each of their heads.

The crowd stood shoulder to shoulder, pressing in toward police lines. Men in long, white robes, fathers holding the hands of children, a salesman with two hunting falcons perched on his leather wristband — they all clustered together, silent and expectant. From the tower of a nearby government building an amplified voice boomed, invoking the name of God and

David Lamb, Nieman Fellow '81, covered the Middle East for The Los Angeles Times from 1982 to 1985. He is the author of The Arabs: Journeys



Beyond the Mirage to be published in February by Random House.

reciting the sins of the murderers Fakieh and Sabie.

Fifteen years earlier, when they were in their twenties, they had robbed and killed a man. But the victim's son had not reached the age of consent and thus was not legally able to approve the death sentence — or to offer forgiveness, which under Islamic law would have earned them their freedom. So they had waited in prison for the young man to grow up and make his choice. Now, the eldest son had become an adult and he had decided. They would die.

Fakieh, the man, was the first to kneel and bend on the cardboard, as though in prayer, according to eyewitness accounts. The executioner's assistant jabbed his ribs with a sharp stick. Fakieh's body stiffened and jerked upward in response just as the glistening sword came down with a whooosh.

an ambulance, and drove off. The crowd drifted away quietly. Islamic justice, known as the *Sharia*, had been carried out.

Sharia translates in Arabic as the road to a watering hole, hence the path of God. It differs fundamentally from Western law in that it is not, in theory, man-made. It is divine, based on God's revelations to the Prophet Mohammed and since it is not case law, judges are not bound by precedent or the decisions of higher courts. The Sharia combines compassion and harshness through a system of checks and balances. Because of its punishments - public beheadings, amputations, floggings, and death by stoning for adulterers and adultresses most Westerners tend to dismiss it as little more than an expression of medieval barbarity.

What this argument ignores, though, is that Saudi Arabia is probably the most crime-free society on

Saudi Arabia is probably the most crimefree society on earth.

The crowd watched wide-eyed, but made no sound. Moments later, the curved sword, held by the executioner like a woodsman's ax, struck again, and Sabie, too, was dead. A doctor stepped forward to confirm the obvious. Two medical attendants tossed the heads and the two bodies onto a stretcher, placed it in

earth. Violent crimes are all but nonexistent, burglaries and thefts rare. You can walk down the darkest street of any Saudi city and not have to look over your shoulder in fear. You can leave your house without bothering to lock the door and set your camera on a park bench without worrying that it will be stolen. If I had left a \$100 bill and my business card on some city sidewalk, it would not have surprised me to return to my hotel and find the money waiting in my message box.

"The *Sharia* has gotten a bad press in the West simply because it runs counter to our trends of thought."

"The Sharia has gotten a bad press in the West simply because it runs counter to our trends of thought," said Frank Vogel, a Fulbright Scholar studying Islamic law in Riyadh. "We treat morality and behavior as an individual matter. The Saudis treat them as social matters that are the responsibility of the entire society.

"Why is the Sharia effective? Because there's basically no crime in Saudi Arabia. In the United States how many women are raped each year? How many people are killed? How many billions of dollars are spent on burglar alarms and anticrime devices? So here they cut off a few hands of guilty people and avoid these horrors. Can you really say that makes them barbaric and us civilized?"

Frank went over to his cluttered desk, shuffled through some papers, and came back with a file of government statistics. During 1982 in Saudi Arabia, a country of seven million people, there were only 14,220 major and minor crimes reported, including consumption of alcohol and adultery. Thefts accounted for 30 percent of the total, alcohol use for 22 percent and burglary for 20 percent. There were 97 premeditated murders and 31 suicides.

For comparison, I asked my editors in California to get me similar statis-

tics for Los Angeles County, which also had a population of seven million. The telex came back the next day: In 1982 there had been 1,415 murders and 499,499 arrests for felonies and misdemeanors.

The Saudis attribute their crime-free environment to the *Sharia*, but I found it curious that apparently no one had done studies to prove conclusively the validity of this relationship. There is, in fact, no firm proof that the Saudis' harsh punishment does deter crime, any more than there is proof that the death penalty in the West deters capital offenses. There were, I thought, some other possible explanations that should be considered before giving Islamic justice wholehearted support:

Saudi Arabia is a country where virtually everyone is rich and no one is poor and there is no need to commit crimes. The Saudis are tribal people with communal bonds, a society that believes in the sanctity of the family and the inviolability of the home. They also are a religious, moral people who accept Koranic warnings about the evils of crime. And the crime rate is minuscule in every Arab country, even though most use a Western-style legal system. So maybe it is the nature of the Arab culture and the strength of the Arabs' faith, rather than the punishment itself, which accounts for the absence of crime and violence.

Under the Saudi system, anyone suspected of a crime is usually arrested immediately and required to make a statement without a lawyer being present. Investigations are carried out by the Ministry of Justice, which recommends to the provincial governor whether to prosecute. During the inquiry, suspects remain in prison, jammed into cells that may hold as many as sixty people. Unlike the United States, however, little violence occurs in Saudi prisons.

Judges in Saudi Arabia are recruited by the Justice Ministry from the top law school graduates and are widely respected for their incorruptibility. They alone decide guilt or innocence and punishment. Their courts are generally closed to all but the accused's family, and no counsel is present at the proceedings. There is no jury, no bail, no writ of habeas corpus. Suspects can be held for months, even years, while investigations are conducted at a leisurely pace.

These may not be the conditions most of us would want to be tried under, but fairness, restraint, and discretion are also built into the system. The circumstances of the crime are always weighed; a poor man, for instance, who stole food to feed his family would not be considered a thief and would be set free. A guilty verdict can be rendered only if there is a confession or there are at least two male witnesses to the crime. Adultery and rape are proved only if four witnesses have seen the actual penetration, an occurrence which presumably does not happen often.

Death sentences must be personally approved by the king - he approves only about a dozen executions a year - and if there is the slightest doubt about guilt, judges reduce the charge to a lesser offense. In addition there are penalties for false accusation. The penalty, for example, for wrongly accusing a chaste woman of adultery is one hundred lashes. And any criminal can be cleared if the family of his victim offers forgiveness - the Koran promises great rewards for this act of charity - or if the family agrees to accept compensation. (The cost of buying one's way out of a murder conviction is about \$40,000.)

Saudi Arabia is the only Arab country that implements the *Sharia* in its entirety and the Saudis are defensive when their legal system is criticized by foreigners. They point to the United States — where the prison population numbers half a million and 20,000 persons are murdered a year — and say to challenging Americans, "Whose system is working — yours or ours?"

On Eloquence and Courage in South Africa

Charlayne Hunter-Gault

"My own experiences in South Africa affected me and my journalistic life more profoundly than anything I can remember."

have a friend who has been talking to me a lot lately about something called synchronicity.

I am drawn to listen sympathetically to her because we are both Pisces. And while she functions more in the realm of the spirit and I more in the realm of the facts — moments like this tend to move me closer to her realm than mine.

Now before you begin to doubt me as a serious journalist with all this talk about astrological signs and things spiritual, let me hasten to explain why I'm becoming a believer in my friend's synchronicity.

There never has been a time in the history of this association that I could have felt more drawn to it than this meeting here in Dallas.

Charlayne Hunter-Gault, a reporter with The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour, gave the above remarks on being named Journalist of the Year by the National Associa-



tion of Black Journalists at their Dallas convention in August. In addition, she received the 1986 NABJ Award for International Reporting for her five-part series on South Africa, Apartheid's People. The series also won a Peabody Award this year.

The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour is seen nationally over stations in the Public Broadcasting Service.

The synchronicity of it involves South Africa.

It so happens that my own experiences in South Africa this past year affected me and my journalistic life more profoundly than anything I can remember.

I never have felt more professionally challenged nor professionally stimulated than in and through my reporting from South Africa. You witnessed for yourself the eloquence of Joe Thloloe and Rich Macondo as they described (during the South Africa panel I moderated) what life was like for them in South Africa. And you heard Allan Boesak — all in one day! And I think I know that what they each had to say affected all of us.

Try to imagine encountering that kind of eloquence — not in the comfort of an auditorium in a country that, for all its faults, allows and protects free speech, but in a place that is source and circumstance of their pain.

I heard them there and, although I could not physically feel their pain — the pain of *apartheid* — I came close.

When I faced Theresa Nguni in Kwathema, she described for me in eloquent detail how she was beaten for no reason in her home by agents of the state security force, and then lifted her sweater to reveal her huge breasts ringed with black and blue bruises, her back marked with inchlong leech-like scars — her head a mass of raw patches. I came as close to feeling the pain of apartheid as a stranger could. I excused my journalistic self from the room where she sat in all her pain, and I wept uncontrollably as a human being.

When I talked with the black school children who know precisely how they were being crippled by the second class education they were getting, I heard echoes of my very own words describing what it was like for me and other black children growing up in the segregated south of America. I came as close to feeling the pain of apartheid as a stranger could.

When I talked with teachers and labor leaders and poets and workers about their days and weeks and months in detention for their non-

I came as close to feeling the pain of apartheid as a stranger could.

Terrorism and Propaganda

Michael Kirkhorn

Foreign correspondents needed initiative and intelligence to cover the earlier "wars of nerves" — attributes still necessary to understand today's acts of terrorism.

I thas become one of our rituals: A bomb explodes in Paris, Rome, London, or Beirut; reporters collect the gruesome details; the television news readers tell the world that "no group has yet claimed responsibility" for yet another act of terrorism.

If American diplomats are involved, or passengers are held hostage in an airliner, we cover the drama to its ugly ending and help orchestrate the relief from anxiety that accompanies the return of survivors. Then, after a few weeks we find ourselves attending conferences, where with a fair degree of futility we wonder aloud whether we should have restrained our coverage to deny the terrorists the nourishment of publicity knowing all the while that the next explosion will release the same reflex, and we probably will do it all over again, pretty much as before.

Our discussions about the coverage of terrorism are circular partly because we feel alone with the problem. But that is not quite the case.

Earlier in this century another generation of American journalists

Michael Kirkhorn, Nieman Fellow '71, is an associate professor in the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, New York University. He



also is an associate of the University's Center for War, Peace, and the News Media.

encountered terrorism, the most dangerous kind — one that succeeds. Correspondents who served American newspapers abroad after a Bolshevik Revolution and down to the fall of France, witnessed a relentless assault on civilized custom and confidence. To a public largely indifferent and distracted by the silliness of "jazz journalism," they reported the evidence that violence and propaganda, skillfully combined, will undermine and bring down civilization.

These correspondents of the 1920's and 1930's had their lapses and failures, but they reported on terrorism with an initiative and intelligence we still can admire, and over those horrifying years developed a way of looking at terror, and particularly the blending of terrorism and propaganda that some of them came to call the "nerve-war."

Terrorism is not a twentieth century invention. But the unremitting terror observed by these early correspondents had no precedent in scale and influence. It was employed not only to crush sizeable opposition to totalitarian rule in the Soviet Union, Italy, and Germany, but to mobilize and enthrall vast populations in those and other nations.

Terror was woven into the political strategies of the dictators, and it contributed to the creation of the indispensable psychological condition for the rise of dictatorship—the prevalence of dread. The dictators who rose in the 1920's and 1930's found support in discontent, confusion, fanaticism, and the habit of

obedience. The reluctant, the unconvinced, the foot-draggers, the doubters, the resisters, were managed through terrorism.

"Zeal and terror are the two psychological instruments for the accomplishment of the (Five Year) Plan," H.R. Knickerbocker of the New York Evening Post and the Philadelphia Public Ledger reported in his Pulitzer Prize-winning series on Soviet Russia in 1929. "Zeal on the part of the 'believers,' terror on the part of the 'unbelievers.' The terror has become a permanent institution. There appears not the slightest intention to abandon or abate it."

A comparison between the terrorism of the 1920's and the 1980's probably would leave us no more enlightened than we are now about the current onslaught, which kills the innocent, produces dread, and causes great confusion at conferences devoted to its explication.

But there are questions worth considering and they have to do not with the terrorist but with the journalist. How does the journalist think about terrorism? The event may be clear - a mob attacking Jewish businesses in Berlin more than five decades ago, a hijacked airliner this year - but how should the event be conveyed to readers? How can a reporter who has witnessed the murder of an innocent hostage maintain impartiality and independence of judgment? Should the effort be made? Do reporters clearly understand their part in the process by which terrorists publicize their demands?

The two-decade-long succession of dilemmas that forced journalists of an earlier period to think about these questions began in the Soviet Union after the revolution. Much of that reporting of the revolution and the civil war had been wrong-headed or biased, as Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz demonstrated in their report for The New Republic in 1920. Accounts written by the passionate "apostles of Bolshevism"-American journalists such as John Reed. Louise Bryant. Albert Rhys Williams, Anna Louise Strong dramatized the pageantry and vigorous social reforms of the revolutionaries and excused their errors and offenses.

ienced an illumination:

"That was it; they were children. Russia is young! . . . It is primeval as the wilderness is primeval . . . The Slavs are the last barbarians, the Bronze Age smashing into the age of Steel. The more one sees of them — the revolutionary oligarchy, the proletarian leaders in the towns, the peasants in the villages, the whooping reformers in the factories, offices and schools, all the solemn workers in the improvised laboratories of a thousand crude and cosmic experiments — the more gorgeously, recklessly infantile they seem."

But by the late 1920's the tone of reporting from the Soviet Union was changing. The cruelty of the Soviet

A Moscow assignment in the 1920's, George Seldes said, "was the journalistic prize, the most exciting in the world."

Others were simply caught up in the thrill of witnessing the transformation of an enormous nation. A Moscow assignment in the 1920's, George Seldes said, "was the journalistic prize, the most exciting in the world." The fomenting of revolution in so great, inert, and mysterious a land defied the imagination of American journalists. And then, Russia was insulated by innocent, more or less literary assumptions about its character - the deeply tangled, passionate, and unpredictable Russian character - the oriental character of Russia, where strange things happened because strange things always happen.

Correspondents were captivated by the mystique. As Soviet frontier guards fumbled innocently in her luggage, *The New York Times'* Anne O'Hare McCormick, who would attain eminence not only as a columnist but as the first woman to sit on the *Times'* editorial board, exper-

regime was the solvent that destroyed the more hopeful expectations of correspondents who were inclined to be charitable as well as those who were not.

With the exception of The New York Times' Walter Duranty, who soft-pedalled the harshness of Soviet rule, American correspondents who had lived for some time in the Soviet Union reported forthrightly on Soviet terrorism, or chafed under the censorship that would have resulted in their expulsion if they had done so. But their experience in the Soviet Union and their understanding of the mentality of its leadership allowed them to provide a context that explained the regime's destruction of opposition and independent thought.

Knickerbocker interpreted terrorism as an expression of the urgencies of the Five Year Plan, which was intended to provide at breakneck speed industrial independence and military security for a nation whose leaders were convinced that imperialist enemies were preparing to isolate and perhaps invade the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders used terror to crush those who would delay the progress of their plan.

Others were as forthright, but offered less explanation. When he arrived in the Soviet Union from Helsingfors in 1932 to take over the Chicago Daily News' Moscow bureau, William Stoneman was prepared for unpleasantness. Obviously, for him, the experiment was over. He noted "the odorous cloud that greeted visitors to the workers paradise - a fearful blend of cabbage soup, human excrement, perspiration, and the smell of sour black bread." Undissuaded, to his credit, by United States Ambassador William Bullitt, who "said he couldn't understand why I talked and wrote so much about 'terror,'" Stoneman pursued with great enterprise and some courage the stories that were making it increasingly difficult for anyone in the West to feel much sympathy for the Soviet regime.

Dodging the authorities, Stoneman went out to see the induced famine with which the Soviet government was destroying opposition to collective farming. Early in 1933 he reported that "virtual martial law rules the villages of the Kuban cossack country," where peasants had resisted collectivizing," and "mass exiles of the peasantry and day and night grain raids on the villages by which the demoralized peasantry had been stripped of every kernel of grain that could be found."

Stoneman also deserves some credit for rejecting the official explanations for the famine (the confiscated grain was needed to feed the Soviet army preparing to defend against an invasion by Japan, etc.). But he obviously had little trouble believing the worst of the Soviet leadership. A stronger moral effort was required for correspondents who had been sympathetic to the revolu-

tion and therefore found the corruption of the revolutionary spirit disturbing.

William Henry Chamberlin had been in the Soviet Union for twelve years when he expressed his indictment in 1934. Frustrated by the censorship that prevented him from reporting the famine of 1932, *The Christian Science Monitor* correspondent felt with ever-greater urgency that the truth needed to be told about Soviet terror.

Chamberlin gave up his Moscow post to report without censorship. In an article published in the Atlantic Monthly of March, 1934, he wrote that no improvements in the conditions of the Soviet people offset "the permanent and odious system of terrorism and espionage. There is the decimation of the intelligentsia through secret arrests and banishments and most unconvincing 'sabotage' trials. There is the subjection of the peasantry to wholesale deportations and to a 'military feudal exploitation' that reached its terrible and inevitable climax in the great famine of 1932-1933 - all for the sake of imposing on the peasants an alien and unfamiliar system (collectivization) which certainly has yet to prove its productive advantages."

"It is my personal belief that the Bolshevik Revolution and the Soviet regime which grew out of it can only be understood as an example of historical tragedy of the deepest and truest type, a tragedy of cruelty, of the crushing out of innumerable individual lives, not from sheer wanton selfishness, but from perverted fanatical idealism — always the surest source of absolute ruthlessness."

The American press nevertheless greeted the dictators benignly. Stalin's mysteriousness was intriguing and inspired a conjectural reporting that obscured as much as it revealed about Soviet intentions. Adolph Hitler was an outlander whose radicalism, the correspondents were assured, would be moderated if he managed to take power. Correspondents as astute as Dorothy

Thompson and Janet Flanner (*The New Yorker's* "Genet") underrated him, though correspondents such as Sigrid Schultz, of the *Chicago Tribune*, who understood the depth of German resentment, did not.

Of all the dictators, Benito Mussolini was the easiest target. The New York Times' Herbert Matthews admired the manliness of the Italian fascist armies as they marched across Abyssinia, and some of the earlier correspondents praised Mussolini for introducing reforms. But his street gangs, beating opponents and forcing castor oil down their throats, struck an American chord. Bill Bolitho, the South African journalist, said in the New York World. that Mussolini and his supporters were gangsters and that fascism was a disguise for their greedy violence.

Carroll Binder, foreign editor of the Chicago Daily News, a Quaker, a pacifist, and Stoneman's boss, believed dictatorship "was the work of the devil." Influenced by this view, Stoneman decided "at the very outset of my life as a foreign correspondent, to write about Mussolini as I would have written about any other, more modest gangster."

Leland Stowe, another member of the Chicago Daily News' outstanding foreign service between the world wars, wrote in 1934: "Among the foremost refinements of the twentieth century must be listed (the) systematic and wholesale manufacture of public opinion." In Europe, he wrote, this manufacture of "mass idea, mass prejudice, or mass emotion" had stripped democracy of its defenses. In Germany

Strangling public opinion was the result of campaigns of terror and propaganda that the Nazis blended together with such skill.

The homely analogy between mob violence in Rome and Chicago had some value. It never is easy for journalists faced with turmoil in a strange land to come to the point where they can recognize clearly and unequivocally the essential moral fact - with terrorism, unjustifiable cruelty to opponents, doubters, and those who are simply innocent. First the shrouds of censorship and propaganda and deception must be swept aside. Mussolini's thugs made it easy. George Seldes, of the Chicago Tribune's Rome bureau, thought that if Mussolini had emigrated he might have become "the mayor of New York, but more likely the boss of the waterfront gangs." While he was reporting from Italy, Stoneman held the same view, one that was frankly moralistic.

the free press was dead. Oncedistinguished newspapers such as the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Frankfurter Zeitung* suppressed the news and lied to their readers.

The strangling of public opinion was the result of the relentless campaigns of terror and propaganda that the Nazis blended together with such skill. In Nazi Germany in the early 1930's, correspondents had some inkling of the distortion of ordinary life and aspiration that was possible when every mind was warped by the constant, inescapable lying of all the organs of information, and by the threat of physical violence to those who resisted. But France and Great Britain were powerful, Poland and Czechoslovakia were intact; Hitler was considered a local threat.

The better correspondents, those who knew Europe and particularly Germany, were able to analyze the rise of fascism and Nazism in ways we never seem quite able to apply in our interpretations of the persistence of terrorism in the Middle East. In 1932, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, of the Daily News, wrote a "social analysis" of Germany in which he revealed the discontent that gained support for fascism: "The German middle class has been reduced to pauperism. The German peasants are under severe financial pressure. The artisans are slowly but surely being exterminated financially."

The following year, he reported "hair-raising terrorism" even within the Nazi organization, and as Hitler challenged the 85-year-old Paul von Hindenburg for the presidency, Mowrer predicted that a victory for Hitler would "mean an end of democracy in Germany, an attempt to restore the rights of capital by destroying the rights of labor . . . a violent suppression of socialism and communism by Nazi armed bands supported morally by the police and the army."

Terrorism needs journalistic interpretation. A confused public may participate in our rituals of coverage, but it never understands the sources of the ugliness and therefore remains complacent though superficially excited by each outburst of terrorism. The Manchester Guardian was struggling with this complacency in 1933 when it reported that Berlin was "the scene of countless horrible outrages" and that those responsible for the outrages also seized on every opportunity "for spreading untruth and suppressing truth." Germany, the Guardian said, was moving from nonlegal (beatings, torture, murder) to legal (imprisonment or death under specially enacted laws) terror. The threat to civilization was growing because the legal terror, though merciless, "is at least as effective and does not appear so barbaric in the eyes of the world."

The effectiveness of terror was

clear to correspondents; its extent was not. That understanding came only when the Spanish fascists rose against the governing republic in 1936. The Italian and German governments sent forces, including large numbers of airplanes and pilots, to support the Spanish fascists; international brigades of volunteers were formed to join the defense of the republic. The German and Italian fascists proved that terror could be exported. Up to that point, modern terrorism had been used mainly in civil conflict, within the Soviet Union, Germany, and Italy, The Spanish Civil War would have been monstrously bloody in any case, but it was both bloodier and more ominous because of the presence of the fascist powers that would terrorize Europe until 1945.

Correspondents covering the war knew that it was a bitter taste of what was to come. Some, such as Mowrer and Vincent Sheean, the correspondent whose Personal History had become credo for the new generation of foreign correspondents, traveled back and forth to Paris, where they tried to persuade the French to give up neutrality and defend the Spanish republic. Others felt that journalism was useless; they decided to fight. George Orwell, who had come to Barcelona to report, joined the anarchist militia: Louis Fischer, a well-known correspondent, also joined a military unit; Sheean, uneasy about his "journalistic impatience" to get a story, felt guilty but remained a correspondent. James Lardner, son of Ring Lardner, "long-legged and cheerful," Sheean said, "schooled at Andover and Harvard and wearing a collegiate coat of brown tweed," rode down from Paris with Sheean and Ernest Hemingway, intending to report for the New York Herald Tribune. Once in Spain, the 23-year-old Lardner upset his friends by joining the Lincoln Battalion of American volunteers. "This is a fight that will have to be won sooner or later, and I'm in favor of doing it here and now," he told a

New York Times reporter. "If the Fascists are not driven out of Spain this year, it will mean much bloodshed ahead." He was the last Lincoln Battalion volunteer to die before the unit left Spain.

From the Spanish Civil War the press learned something else about terrorism. Ordinary people were prepared to resist it. Time and again American correspondents were amazed by the fortitude of the Spanish people, by the ragtag and barely armed volunteers of the Republic, and, for that matter, by the bravery of the Spanish fascists who held the Alcazar at Toledo against furious assaults by Republican forces. It may be that after so many victories for terror, in which its opponents were swiftly crushed, Spain provided the example that allowed correspondents of the Second World War, like Ernie Pyle, to place such trust in ordinary goodness and courage.

Spain was a prelude to the Second World War, and as the storm approached France, a profound book, Strategy of Terror, was written by Edmond Taylor of the Chicago Tribune, and later of CBS News. In his own deep premonitions and everyday anxiety, Taylor knew what it all meant.

"Yet fear, bearable or not, was always with us during the summer of 1939." Taylor wrote. "Fear of war as a collective catastrophe, undepictable to the imagination like death, though no less terrible for that, and the more precise fear of planes in the night, dropping explosive punishment as well as death. Aerial bombing of cities has definitely entered into folklore as one of the horror-legends of our time. That, as I noticed myself in Spain, is one of the reasons for the peculiar effectiveness of this weapon against troops in the field, particularly when inexperienced and unprotected. Bombing is part of the war in the mind; perhaps this war will dissipate the nightmare, but it was still very vivid at the outbreak."

continued to page 29

Broadcasting Guidelines for Covering Crises

In response to a request from the editors of Nieman Reports, the ABC, CBS, and NBC networks forwarded copies of their guidelines for covering civil disorders, acts of terrorism, hostage situations, and other significant news stories. The guidelines are printed with permission from the networks and appear as issued.

ABC: Coverage of Riots and Other Civil Disorders

The coverage of civil disorders requires particular vigilance. As with wars, the first casualty in these situations tends to be the truth.

ABC News intends to cover riots and related disturbances with particular concern for the accuracy and objectivity of our reporting. We are also determined to cover such stories as inconspicuously and unobtrusively as possible.

What follows are some guidelines developed over the years.

- Do not call a disturbance a "riot" unless the term is clearly justified by the size and severity of the situation.
- 2) Accounts by participants should be treated with caution, and, if used at all, verified by other sources. Interviews with participants should be broadcast with care since they tend to incite rather than inform. Attribute statements, crowd estimates, etc., very carefully.
- 3) Avoid reports about "crowds gathering" and other such anticipatory information. Our duty is to report the story when it happens, not before. But reporters should be on the scene quickly so that when we report, we report accurately.
- 4) Avoid the use of inflammatory catchwords and cliches such as "An angry mob erupted with explosive violence as tensions

- mounted and full-scale rioting was feared." Good journalism demands specificity cool, calm, factual reporting of just what happened.
- 5) Facts must be reported in perspective. The size of the crowd, for example, ought to be given in relation to the size of the community.
- 6) News personnel required on the scene must remain as unobtrusive as possible. This means traveling in unmarked cars whenever possible. Also it means being restrained and neutral in what you say and what you do at the scene.
- 7) Avoid using lights except when they are essential to cover important aspects of the story. If it appears they may be instigating, perpetuating, or intensifying a dangerous situation, turn them off.
- 8) Obey police instructions. But report to your supervisor any police action that appears designed primarily to suppress or limit legitimate news coverage. We do not want to enter into local agreements limiting coverage. No such agreements can be made without the specific approval of ABC News management.
- 9) Cover the disturbance exactly as it happens with no staging, simulation, reenactment or other means which in any way influences the participants to do

- anything, or refrain from doing anything.
- 10) We cannot properly report on violence and ignore its causes. Therefore, we want as soon as possible to explore the background of the situation and the issues and circumstances that led to the disturbance. If the cause is not clear, let's say so. But only after making every effort to find out.
- 11) We would rather miss a story than mis-report it. Use bulletins with care. Remember the difference between rumor and fact. And eliminate adjectives in order to avoid coloring the story.

All of these are good guides, but they cannot substitute for the judgment, discretion, and integrity of newspersons covering explosive situations.

Finally, it cannot be overemphasized that we cover events as reporters, not as participants. In inflammatory situations especially, everyone assigned by ABC News must be vigilant that their individual or collective actions are as detached and unobtrusive as possible. Still, it is possible that even the most professionally detached news team may by its very presence contribute to a disturbance by passively causing others to take actions that they otherwise might not take. It then becomes the responsibility of those on the scene to exercise their judgment about when to pull back and, if necessary, when to pull out.

We are also concerned about the safety of our people. We want to get the story. But we would rather lose a story than lose a life. Those on the scene must decide when risks to their safety dictate moving to another location or leaving the scene entirely.

Reporting on acts of terrorism, especially those involving hostages, requires strict adherence to the same general principles and many of the specific guidelines developed for covering riots and civil disorders. We must take great care that our actions do not unintentionally make a sensational situation even more sensational. We must do nothing that could jeopardize the lives of hostages. or interfere with efforts by authorities to secure their safe release. We must guard against efforts by terrorists to use, or manipulate us for their own ends.

Here are the specific guidelines:

- 1) No such incident should be broadcast live except in the most compelling circumstances, and then only with the approval of the President of ABC News or a designated Vice President. (This policy does not prohibit live and live-to-tape reports by correspondents at the scene.)
- 2) Telephone interviews with hostages and/or terrorists during the incident should be handled with great care and undertaken only after ascertaining that ABC's use of telephone lines does not interfere with the authorities' communication, or further jeopardize the safety of hostages.
- 3) Demands of the terrorist(s) should be reported as an essential ingredient of the story. But we must avoid becoming a platform for propaganda and rhetoric. In most cases, this means we will condense, edit, or paraphrase the demands and explain the background against which they are made.
- 4) ABC News personnel assigned to

the story should obey all instructions issued by police or other competent authorities. But they should report to their supervisors any such order that appears intended to manage or suppress the news.

Even when all the principles and guidelines are scrupulously applied, it may still be said that the news coverage aggravated a particular situation, or contributed to the "contagion" of terrorism. Mindful as we are of this, we cannot regard suppression of such reporting as being justified. To suppress news of terrorism would raise serious questions about our credibility on other issues. ("What else are they keeping from us?"). To suppress the news would surrender objective reporting to whatever rumors were being circulated. And to suppress the news for whatever reason, good or bad, violates the fundamental principle that governs a free press in a free society.

CBS: Production Standards

Government Restrictions on News Coverage (12/12/85)

In covering continuing and significant news stories in the face of restrictions imposed by governments, it remains an obligation of CBS News to report them as completely, objectively, and accurately as possible, and without compromising the standards of CBS News, according to these policy guidelines.

- 1) As it has always done, CBS News will protest, respectfully but strongly, imposition of restrictions by government on free coverage of the news, including the use of force, threats, blocking of access or transmission, or other types of censorship.
- 2) CBS News personnel faced by any such restrictions to free reporting will obey all bona fide orders of proper law enforcement officials.

- 3) CBS News personnel will ask permission to cover events in accordance with the law. If television camera or radio coverage is forbidden, correspondents and crews are to seek the highest ranking official on the scene to appeal. If permission is still refused, the incident is to be reported to the responsible CBS News bureau as soon as possible. Permission should be sought to allow CBS News personnel to cover the event without cameras, taking notes and with recorders, in the same way as print journalists.
- 4) A correspondent thus forced to report a story without pictures and sound should make every effort to relate the events through the use of illustrative stand-ups, interviews with eyewitnesses, and similar techniques.
- 5) Anytime we are refused permission to cover any event that we believe to be a story, or the news material is censored, the fact is to be included in any script offered. If CBS News personnel are harassed by police, detained, or arrested, that information should be included in any script offered as well.
- 6) As with all stories, final responsibility for content will rest with CBS News management in New York, which will decide on such matters as which events will be covered; inclusion of the facts relating to government restrictions on coverage of the story; use of background material relevant to the story; and illustrative matter available in the United States that will amplify and lend perspective to the coverage.

Coverage of Terrorists (4/7/77)

Because the facts and circumstances of each case vary, there can be no specific self-executing rules for the handling of terrorist/hostage stories. CBS News will continue to apply the normal tests of news judg-

21

ment and if, as so often they are, these stories are newsworthy, we must continue to give them coverage despite the dangers of "contagion." The disadvantages of suppression are, among other things, (1) adversely affecting our credibility ("What else are the news people keeping from us?"); (2) giving free rein to sensationalized and erroneous word-of-mouth rumors: and (3) distorting our news judgments for some extraneous purpose.

Nevertheless, in providing for such coverage there must be thoughtful, conscientious care and restraint. Obviously, the story should not be sensationalized beyond the actual fact of its being sensational. We should exercise particular care in how we treat the terrorist/kidnapper.

More specifically:

- 1) An essential component of the story is the demands of the terrorist/kidnapper and we must report those demands. But we should avoid providing an excessive platform for the terrorist/kidnapper. Thus, unless such demands are succinctly stated and free of rhetoric and propaganda, it may be better to paraphrase the demands instead of presenting them directly through the voice or picture of the terrorist/kidnapper.
- 2) Except in the most compelling circumstances, and then only with the approval of the president of CBS News, or in the president's absence, the senior vice president of News, there should be no live coverage of the terrorist/kidnapper, since we may fall into the trap of providing an unedited platform for him/her. (This does not limit live on-the-spot reporting by CBS News reporters, but care should be exercised to assure restraint and context.)
- 3) News personnel should be mindful of the probable need by the authorities who are dealing with the terrorist for communication

- by telephone and hence should endeavor to ascertain, wherever feasible, whether our own use of such lines would be likely to interfere with the authorities' communications.
- 4) Responsible CBS News representatives should endeavor to contact experts dealing with the hostage situation to determine whether they have any guidance on such questions as phraseology to be avoided, what kinds of questions or reports might tend to exacerbate the situation, etc. Any such recommendations by established authorities on the scene should be carefully considered as guidance (but not as instruction) by CBS News personnel.
- 5) Local authorities should also be given the name or names of CBS personnel whom they can contact should they have further guidance or wish to deal with such delicate questions as a newsman's call to the terrorists or other matters that might interfere with authorities dealing with the terrorists.
- 6) Guidelines affecting our coverage of civil disturbances are also applicable here, especially those which relate to avoiding the use of inflammatory catchwords or phrases, the reporting of rumors, etc. As in the case of policy dealing with civil disturbances, in dealing with a hostage story reporters should obey all police instructions, but report immediately to their superiors any such instructions that seem to be intended to manage or suppress the news.

NBC: Reporting Critical Events

- 1) Q. Should NBC News give extensive coverage to hostage stories?
 - A. We are in the business of covering news of interest and importance. We cannot sub-

- scribe to stipulations or recommendations that we ignore the hostages or their families - or even the hostage-takers - on the assumption that if we keep them off television and radio, the crisis situation will go away. Our first journalistic obligation, always, is to our viewers and listeners. All America wanted and needed regular and trustworthy news reports on their fellow citizens held in Beirut, and NBC News answered this public need throughout the crisis on both our radio and television networks.
- 2) Q. What restraints, if any, should NBC News apply to its coverage of critical events such as the TWA Hostage story?
 - A. Taste and judgment are the most reliable barometers of sound journalistic practice. There are times when restraints should be imposed voluntarily on coverage at the scenes of events, as well as back at the broadcast centers. During the TWA hostage crisis, NBC News on at least three occasions withheld sensitive information from its news programs. Thus, on Tuesday, July 2, on NBC Nightly News, Navy technician Claude Whitmoyer of Severn, MD., a returned hostage, thanked the media for keeping his high-security military clearance secret during this ordeal abroad. And in a letter to NBC News dated July 1, 1985, the United States Navy expressed appreciation for the "sensitivity and restraint exercised by the National Broadcasting Company during the recent hostage crisis." The letter continued, ". . . faced with the dilemma of

possibly endangering hostages by reporting all you knew, your organization ignored the competitive pressures and acted responsibly."

- 3) O. Was NBC News "used" covering the extended TWA Hostage story?
 - A. There is no doubt that television has become a primary means of communications for terrorists, for hostages, and for the families of hostages. At times, television has also become one of the means by which the diplomatic parties involved exchange their positions and messages. One columnist has called television news "the international nervous system." We cannot ignore this modern communications function - even though we did not ask for it - and still operate as effective and honest broadcast journalists.
- 4) O. What can NBC News do to avoid becoming "part of the story"?
 - A. Cover only what is happening. Make no effort to change or dramatize what is happening. Make no effort to influence participants or observers to do or refrain from doing anything.

Do not become involved as a participant in any way.

Include nothing in a broadcast report which might give an erroneous impression of what actually took place.

- 5) O. How should NBC News personnel conduct themselves when covering a continuing terrorist/hostage story, or an otherwise tense or dangerous situation?
 - A. The visibility of equipment and personnel at the scene of a disturbance should be minimized to the fullest ex-

tent consistent with adequate coverage. To this end, NBC News employees will try to:

Travel to the scene in an unmarked car.

Avoid conspicuous locations for cameras, lights, microphones, and other equipment.

Limit the use of lights.

Maintain a low profile.

Avoid debates with participants or observers.

Be prudent in reactions to comments or abuse.

Be as accurate and objective as possible.

If, despite these efforts, NBC News employees are convinced that their activities could exacerbate a dangerous situation, they will discontinue those activities prompt-

A civil disturbance will not be broadcast on a live basis except in very special circumstances, and then only with the prior approval of the President or Executive Vice President of NBC News.

NBC News personnel may leave an area which they perceive to be hazardous to their well-being. (The potential loss of a story is of secondary importance to the health and safety of the personnel.)

Each employee at the scene of a disturbance has the options to:

Continue the coverage.

Move to another location where in the judgement of the employee continued coverage will not be so hazardous.

Discontinue the coverage and leave the scene.

- 6. Q. How can we keep such a major running story in proper perspective?
 - A. a) We must frequently remind our audience of prevailing conditions: hostages are obviously under

stress: armed terrorists may be playing to the cameras or modifying their behavior because cameras are present. There should be regular references on-the-air by our reporters providing context and perspective as well as super-imposed visual information.

- b) We should cite past experiences when relevant: Example: "The Stockholm syndrome," that psychological reaction whereby captives may feel empathy for their captors or sympathize with the political positions of those holding them captive.
- c) When security conditions permit, full explanations of the personal backgrounds and possible motivations of both the hostages and their captors are often useful in providing complete reporting.
- d) Include on-the-air reports of related news elements of the unfolding story, developments perhaps occurring elsewhere that those being interviewed may well be unaware of in their isolation.
- 7) O. How should we handle hostage and terrorist interviews?
 - A. First, it is far preferable to tape and edit all interviews for air that emerge from terrorist/hostage situations. However, recognizing there may be urgent circumstances requiring live transmissions, special care must be exercised in broadcasting them. In live situations, our correspondents on-the-air should frequently remind our audiences of the background, circumstances, and context of such special live television news transmis-

sions on NBC.

We also have to be vigilant to avoid soliciting special messages to the negotiating authorities. We should refrain from asking questions in interviews with hostages or members of their families about negotiating positions, or questions that could endanger the hostages, or questions based on hearsay or unproved allegations.

- 8) Q. Can we buy news materials?
 - A. NBC News can purchase relevant diaries or photographic materials that fall within the category of memoirs.

In all cases these editorial purchases must be cleared at the top level of the News Division, and the facts must be revealed on-the-air so that our viewers and listeners can know the circumstances and judge these program elements appropriately. (It should be noted that at no time during the TWA Hostage crisis did NBC News purchase anything from the hostage captors or from any of the parties involved.)

- 9) Q. Should NBC News pay travel and living expenses of hostage families who wish to be reunited overseas with their freed family members?
 - A. We can pay such expenses, as is our general practice for interview programs, but we cannot intrude on their personal reunions and privacy. We should be sensitive to their needs and concerns. We cannot impose our own captivity on the families. making it impossible for other media representatives to interview them on scene. However, we can reasonably ask that these families, as guests of NBC News, be mindful of our own program-

- ming needs. NBC News management, in all such cases, must be notified in advance of any such arrangements.
- 10) Q. How frequently should we take air with hostage updates?
 - A. Editorial judgment must determine when NBC News will interrupt for regular program schedule. Such interruptions should be done rarely and only for the most important news developments. We should not go on the air just to be competitive. We must be mindful of our regularly-scheduled news programs and Digests when these can satisfactorily serve the update function and responsibility. We should avoid airing unedited tape and live crisis pictures unless there are extraordinarily compelling and urgent reasons for doing so. And in that case it is essential that our correspondents fully explain each situation as it is being broadcast.
- 11) Q. What is the NBC News position on network pools and overall pooling in hostage situations?
 - A. NBC News is opposed to pooling access to news or to news materials. Competition is essential to a free and open press. There may be situations where pools are to be considered reluctantly, on a case-by-case basis, and then only in crisis news coverage circumstances.
- 12) Q. Attorney General Edwin Meese, at a news conference prior to his address to the American Bar Association convention in London on July 17 [1985], proposed that U.S. news organizations voluntarily delay, by common agreement, "some reporting of terrorist incidents." What is NBC News' reaction to

- that proposal?
- A. NBC News is opposed to any government-imposed or government-proposed before-the-fact agreements with other news organizations for automatic reportorial restraints or delays. NBC News intends to continue to follow its own journalistic standards and practices, and we expect that other free and independent news organizations will do likewise each unilaterally and each responsibly.
- 13) Q. Does the intense network news competition to be first and to attract audiences unduly influence or degrade responsible news judgments?
 - A. Generally speaking, competition in news, as in most areas, results in a better service to the nation's viewers and listeners. No single news source is better than a multiplicity of news services. However, in no case should pure competitive pressures diminish responsible journalistic practices. And to be sure that standard applies, NBC News will refrain from issuing press releases and publicizing competitive claims about ratings. scoops, special programs, etc., during major crises.

Summary

Professionalism and common sense provide the best guidelines to avoid undue risks, dangers, and the exploitation of news reporting. There must be a delicate balance of our obligation to keep the public informed, our obligation to avoid being used, and our obligation not to exacerbate or sensationalize the situation.











Issues Facing the Dutch **Broadcasting System**

Yvonne van der Heijden

The non-commercial system shakes on its foundations.

■ he Dutch broadcasting system is unique in all the world, but should it be commercial or non-commercial? That question is as old as the first broadcasting organization when it came into being in the early 1920's. The discussion always has been highly political with, on the one hand, Catholics and orthodox Protestants, and, on the other hand, the liberals. Since The Netherlands has a coalition government, every now and then it has caused huge problems in politics that, in 1965, even led to a cabinet crisis.

However, the answer to the persistent question might come early in

Yvonne van der Heijden, Nieman Fellow '86, reports on The Hague, The Netherlands, covering economics and politics for Brabant Press, a publisher of four



regional daily newspapers in the south: Brabants Dagblad, Eindhovens Dagblad, Helmonds Dagblad, and Het Nieuwsblad. She is based in Zuid, Holland.

1987 and not from politicians, but from the European Court of Justice. The European judge can destroy the present non-commercial public broadcasting system by forcing the Dutch to give foreign commercial organizations access to cable television without any restrictions.

As of 1987, a new Media Act will exist. It will replace the twentyyear-old Broadcasting Act; the broadcasting system will stay non-commercial. The new cabinet, nevertheless, has agreed to a small possibility for change into a partly commercial system in the near future. This solution to a complicated problem in Dutch politics is a compromise following a year-long struggle between the two coalition parties which have formed the new cabinet since last July: the Christian Democratic CDA, which wants a non-profit system, and the conservative liberal VVD, which supports free enterprise and thus, commercialism. Incidentally, it is the same coalition that has governed since 1982.

As a typical product of Dutch pluralistic open society and cultural values, the Dutch broadcasting system is based on "openness," "variety," and "cooperation." It is supported by private non-profit organizations. They get airtime and are fully responsible for the programs they put on radio and television. The only tasks for the government are to provide licenses to broadcast and to divide available broadcasting time among the organizations. The Minister of Welfare, Health, and Cultural Affairs, who watches public order, morals, and security of state, can withdraw a license, but only after a controversial program has been broadcast.

Conditions

Every non-profit organization in The Netherlands can get broadcasting time. There are, however, some conditions to fulfill. An organization should have at least 100,000 members and radio and television broadcasting must be its main activity. A license will be given only to an organization that will offer a varied selection of programs in the fields of culture (20 percent of its airtime), information (15 percent), education (5 percent), and entertainment (25 percent). The requirement on education is low because the Education











Broadcasting Federation presents special programs.

Whenever an organization has 60,000 members, it may ask for airtime as an "aspirant broadcasting organization." It can get three hours of radio time and one hour of television, and it has three years to become a full-fledged broadcasting organization.

The Minister also allocates broadcasting time to political parties that have seats in the House of Representatives. The amount of time a party gets does not depend on the number of seats or members it has; their broadcasts are all of equal length. Every week ten minutes are available, and the now nine parties in the House use the time slot in rotation. Before elections, the Minister provides extra airtime to the political parties.

The eight private broadcasting organizations include three that are neutral: AVRO, TROS, and Veronica; five that are ideologically based: KRO (Catholic), NCRV (Protestant), VARA (socialist), VPRO (progressive), and EO (evangelical). The airtime an organization gets depends upon the number of members it has. The groups are autonomous in their program planning and transmission. In their choice of programs they will, of course, take into consideration the opinions of their members. It is not an accident that the neutral and popular Veronica shows Dynasty, and the evangelical EO shows Little House on the Prairie.

These private broadcasting organizations operate within a framework called the Netherlands Broadcasting Organization (NOS). This independent foundation provides program

facilities, such as equipment and operators, for all organizations that have obtained broadcasting time. NOS ensures the coordination of the programs and represents the entire Dutch broadcasting system abroad. The organization also has its own airtime and produces its own programs, which are of a general nature or which include subjects for a small audience, such as a ballet performance.

Television News

There are two television channels, Nederland 1 and Nederland 2. Airtime in general is every day between 3:00 p.m. and midnight. In the morning hours the educational programs are broadcast. Every organization has fixed evenings on the channels every week. For example, Monday on

The production of news magazines is reserved for the private organizations which are not allowed to bring the news. The result is quite remarkable.

Imagine a hypothetical situation: The United States has invaded Nicaragua. The facts will be brought on television by NOS in the News broadcast. Later that evening, the socialist VARA will make the event a feature of its weekly news magazine. The day after the invasion, the Catholic KRO is on the air, having decided to present three or four different subjects for its news magazine, and nothing on Nicaragua. Or, in another scenario, the KRO reporters will show a Nicaragua item and present it from their point of view. The advantage of the Dutch system for the public is clear: Sometimes viewers get more information than is needed on one subject, and from various viewpoints. In general,

In general, the disadvantage prevails — the explanation of the news is a mixup and lacks continuity.

Channel 1 brings the programs of VARA and on Channel 2, those of Veronica. On Tuesdays, the AVRO and the NOS presentations are on the air, and so on. Annually on October 1 the organizations get assigned their new scheduled evenings. NOS brings the News every evening on every channel three times. It is, however, not allowed to make programs with current background information.

though, the disadvantage prevails: The explanation of the news is a mixup and lacks continuity.

Commercials

The non-commercial system does not mean that there are no commercials on Dutch radio and television. Advertisements are broadcast at fixed times, immediately preceding and following radio and television news broadcasts. A separate group called STER, Television and Radio Advertising Organization, is the only one allowed to broadcast commercials. Some of the rules that they must follow are: No commercials can be broadcast on Sunday, the Lord's day; advertisements for sweets must show a small toothbrush in the corner, to make clear that sweets are bad for one's teeth; commercials for tobacco products are not allowed; but advertising of alcoholic products

Commercials are important to maintain this broadcasting system, as STER's income is distributed to the various broadcasting organizations. Though only 4 percent of the total television time - 36 minutes a day - is spent showing commercials (in the United States, it is more than 20 percent), STER's income is enough to finance almost a third of all broadcasting expenses, amounting to more than one billion guilders (\$444 million) every year. In 1986, the revenue from commercials will total about 320 million guilders (\$142 million).

The remainder of the costs is financed by the license fees received from those who own radios and television sets. An individual license fee of 158 guilders (\$70) is levied annually on the 4.5 million Dutch who own a radio and a television set; 150,000 persons pay 46 guilders (\$20) each because they have only a radio. Further, the broadcasting organizations receive a small income from members' contributions and from the sale of their radio and television magazines.

Changes

Though the broadcasting system as described stays intact at the present time, and thus non-commercial, the new Media Act will cause some changes in 1987. More commercials will be broadcast, but they won't be riveted to the news programs as they are now. Instead, they will be put in "floating blocks" between programs. As a result, they will not be interrupted by commercials, as they are in the United States. With the added income from this increase of commercials, a third television channel must be realized by next October 1.

Programs will not be interrupted by commercials, like they are in the United States.

Actually, the government does not like the prospect of extra commercials, but the politicians feel the threat of foreign commercial broadcasting organizations. Already Sky Channel and such organizations broadcast their programs on Dutch cable television, which accounts for the fear that Dutch industries will use up their commercial budgets to pay for foreign advertisements to be shown to Dutch viewers. That would mean less income for STER, and thus the maintenance of the system would be in danger.

In any event, these foreign commercial broadcasting organizations ultimately may cause the breakdown of the Dutch system, despite the new Media Act or even the government policy accord. Now foreign commercial organizations are forbidden to aim their advertisements at the Dutch public. (Internationally-aimed advertisements are allowed.) Moreover, they are not allowed to subtitle programs in the Dutch language. A few months hence, in the spring, the European Court of Justice will pass judgment on these prohibitions and determine whether they are contrary to European law.

Jurists expect that the European judge will declare the subtitle prohibition null and void. More important, however, is what will happen to the prohibition on commercials. Within the European community. countries are forbidden to hinder the free traffic of services. The question now is: Is putting a foreign commercial television program on the air something like that? If the answer is affirmative, the protection of the non-commercial system will be destroyed, because the Dutch no longer will be allowed to make restrictions on television programs. Then the commercial foreign broadcasting organizations will lose their monopoly.

If the judge will respect the Dutch rule as a method to protect the national broadcasting system and the national cultural values, then the system will be partly commercial some years from now. The government policy accord of last July binds the Minister to open a commercial channel when three private broadcasting organizations ask for it. When there are only two, the realization of a commercial channel will be discussed in parliament again.

Organizations hesitate to leave the non-commercial system and take the big step to become a commercial channel. Their income from the STER fund and the license fees will cease after one and a half years; they need good financiers to survive. Already two organizations, the neutrals TROS and Veronica, have shown interest. They are at present negotiating with industry to finance the commercial channel. Industries are impatient to get access to the broadcasting system, so an agreement should be possible. (They do not get a broadcasting license because their aim is to make a profit.)

The Dutch non-commercial public broadcasting system is shaking on its foundations; perhaps it may expire before the turn of the century.

Eloquence and Courage

continued from page 15

violent quests for basic rights, and when they persisted once out of detention knowing full well that their actions would probably land them once again in jail, possibly solitary confinement, possibly torture, I was humbled by their courage.

When the basic business of living and breathing and wanting to be treated as a human being requires courage, it forces you in a way that I've never confronted before, to deal with some of the very basic questions in life. The kind we all had to confront the first day we ventured to call ourselves journalists.

The who, what, when, where, and the why.

A New York journalist friend of mine has been going to news conferences for the past twenty years and always asking the same two basic questions: What is the purpose of this news conference and where do we go from here?

We have come a long way and many of us are doing things in journalism that we never dreamed of.

I came back from South Africa renewed. Renewed in my sense of purpose as a journalist, renewed in my determination never to succumb to complacency. Like Zora Neale Hurston's Janie in *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, I had set off on my great journey to the horizons in search of people. And it had been the most important thing in all the world for me to find them, not stories, mind you, but people. And at the end of this journey, for it is exactly one year ago this month that I went to South Africa, I am called

here to Dallas where you have made South Africa a leading item on your agenda, and where you have asked me to moderate the panel on covering South Africa under the state of emergency and where you, my colleagues, are honoring me for a year of work that, even when it didn't deal with South Africa specifically, was informed by my work in South Africa.

When Allan Boesak spoke yesterday of us being bound together in their struggle, I felt the spirit of synchronicity swell up in my body. I know that we have come a long way, and many of us are doing things in journalism that we have never dreamed of — and even if we dared to dream — there once was a time when that truly would have been pipe dreaming. And yet it was not so long ago that we as black journalists were bound together with the black community in a common struggle.

And yet to be bound together in that struggle did not get in the way of our professionalism, of our truthtelling, and of our ability to be fair. What it did was to heighten our passion to do the job at hand. And that enhanced our coverage.

I hope that what you're telling me by the honor you do me tonight is that it's still appropriate to be both passionate and fair. That it's not passe to care about people — in particular on this occasion — people whose struggles are not unlike our own, and especially our journalistic colleagues in South Africa who need not only our moral support, but whose efforts to establish their own independent news voices need our financial support as well.

I also hope that you are telling me and yourselves that there's always one thing that we as black journalists can take for granted — that is, the caring and support that we as a still very special community reserve and maintain for each other. And that failing all else, that will be an unending source of the kind of passion we need for our continuing journeys to the horizons.

British Press

continued from page 7

voluntary act on the part of the person making it. But all too often, if the reader did but know it, statements are far from volunteered. Instead they arise out of persistent questioning. The difference is seldom clear. Sentences beginning "In answer to a question. . ." are unfashionable and no doubt considered ugly, gauche, or unnecessary.

I had to point out last week that your Secretary, Mr. Weinberger, did not exactly dive into a British political controversy over nuclear defense. He was asked questions on the BBC *Panorama* program and, surprise, surprise, he answered them.

As for exclusives, the first rule for any lay reader of the public prints in Britain is to approach stories so identified with the same caution he adopts on entering a second-hand car showroom. The exclusives market relies heavily on recycling. The provincial newspaperman's definition of many a so-called national exclusive is yesterday's real story massaged and annointed into new life.

I believe there is now greater control exercised over the content of a British newspaper's advertisement columns than there is over the news columns, and over the claims made for what fills them.

It is, of course, possible that I—and those who feel like me—are the victims of a generation gap, stranded on a wilder shore of journalism than is good for us. It is also possible that relief is at hand. *Time* magazine reported last year that fairness in journalism had caught on with the American public:

"The aim seems to be spread before the reader an uncontaminated body of information accompanied by welllabelled opinions of advocates of this or that cause. From this the reader can form his own outraged or outrageous opinions." And why not? Because *Time's* headline seemed to suggest this would lead to "The Blanding of Newspapers."

I doubt whether there is much risk of that in Britain. Nor surely is it the only alternative to what we have now? There is surely nothing inherently incompatible as between accuracy and fairness on the one hand, and dynamic presentation, editorial thunder, and commercial success on the other?

The question now before British journalism is whether the opportunity to raise journalism standards presented by titles making a good profit with modest circulations will be seized.

- Will quality of product rank among the criteria of success with profit and circulation?
- Will principled writers be encouraged?
- Will accuracy or presentation weigh more heavily in the reporting of news or will the urge to entertain count for more than the concern to inform?
- Will the drive to be right supplant the drive to be first, right or wrong?
- Will the facts or interpretive comment prevail in news treatment?
- Will freedom be crowned with fairness, or liberty with new forms of license?
- Will that fairness drive out malice or is malice the elixir of profit?
- Will the pendulum swing in the direction of those tough but fairminded journalists with whom it is a joy to work and joust?

I live in hope but not really in expectation.

The opportunity undoubtedly exists; I doubt whether the will to seize it does at all.

Terrorism and Propoganda

continued from page 19

Taylor learned the phrase "war of nerves" from the French press and "found it very difficult to make this newfangled notion . . . clear and real to my readers. . . . " But he understood, if only because the French military officers with whom he talked had begrudgingly understood that "the real aim of psychological warfare as understood by the Nazis was not to convert outsiders to their cause as commercial propagandists do, but to demoralize the enemy, to destroy the cohesion, discipline, and collective morale of hostile social groups. In other words, to break the enemy's will-to-win or simply his will-toresist as in war."

So terrorism was perfected through propaganda; so the Western correspondents and the rest of the world came to understand what the Nazis knew; it was not necessary to kill a population, or an army, if its passivity could be assured by other means.

So everyone came to understand

1920's were better able to understand fascism because they could rely on the judgment of Edgar Ansel Mowrer, who had lived there more than seven years and was considered "amico dell' Italia." How many of our journalists have lived in the Middle East for seven years?

Second: It is not necessarily bad to project upon the moral chaos of terrorism an American viewpoint, risking a bit of ethnocentrism and some homely characterizations for the benefit of conveying a decent regard for the consequences of fanatical acts.

Third: While terrorism and propaganda are usually found together, the terrorists of the 1980's have been unable to sustain that connection. For them terrorism and propaganda have been disjoined. They have no independent voice internationally. They can commit acts of terrorism but not control the information. Their propaganda outlets are in fact the independent, uncontrolled press ABC News, The Los Angeles Times, the Associated Press. Obviously an independent press should evaluate terrorist propaganda. But journalists may ask themselves whether it is better to open the channels of communication further, thereby risking the possibility of be-

It was not necessary to kill a population, or an army, if its passivity could be assured by other means.

the lament of United Press correspondent Webb Miller as he left conquered Spain: "Poor Spain, poor Europe — yes, poor human race!"

What can these correspondents teach us about terrorism?

First: Long familiarity with the conditions that breed terrorism is invaluable for a journalist. The correspondents who worked in Italy in the

ing accused of being propagandists, or close them down and increase the pressure for terrorism on the part of organizations that can find no voice.

Fourth: Some imagination is needed in the coverage of terrorism to sweep away the ideological doubletalk with which terrorists justify their acts, as well as the language with which they are condemned.

THE BOOKSHELF

Dual Obligations in the Newsroom

The White Press and Black America

Carolyn Martindale. Greenwood Press, Inc., 1986. \$29.95.

by Alice Bonner

I twon't be long now before editors and reporters in newsrooms around the country will look up and find bearing down upon them the twentieth anniversary of the historic report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

Then the blitz will be on. News pages and airwaves will be thick with retrospectives and reminiscences of that flammable era and its aftermath. For a few months the venerable 1968 document — often quoted, too seldom heeded — will be the object of more poking and prodding than anything since the Kerner Commission itself undertook to analyze the state of race relations in America, examined it mercilessly, and found the nation "moving toward two societies — one black, one white."

The news media were the target of one of the most stinging indictments brought by the men and women whom Lyndon Johnson enlisted to find out what caused the urban disturbances of the early 1960's and how a recurrence could be prevented. The commission laid to the media — print and broadcast — no small portion of the blame for the regrettable state of black-white affairs in America:

"... The news media have failed to analyze and report adequately on racial problems and ... to meet the Negro's legitimate expectations in journalism.

By and large news organizations have failed to communicate to both

their black and white audiences . . . a sense of the problems America faces and the sources of potential solutions. The media report and write . . . from the standpoint of a white man's world."

As the anniversary approaches, those very news institutions will begin turning Kerner inside out to see how much has changed in our society in two decades. How startling - and in another sense hardly surprising at all - that when they look inward they will find that, despite all the progress made in newsrooms these twenty years, many fundamental deficiencies remain barely changed. That is one of the most valuable points made by Carolyn Martindale in her book, The White Press and Black America.

Although she is often too gentle in pressing her message and her scholarly analyses, the reader cannot escape the reality that Martindale very ably reiterates of intractable racism that most black journalists live with in their work every day — except in the six out of every ten newsrooms that are still all white.

For all the changes that have come about since 1968 — changes that Martindale carefully enumerates and documents — her findings and recommendations are not very different from those of the Kerner report.

Among the "very obvious strides" made over the past two decades in covering black Americans, she notes: more black faces in newspapers and on television, much more coverage of blacks involved in every-day activities, dropping of the race label except

when relevant, discontinuing "colored news" sections, black columnists, improved sensitivity to black pride and black presence, and a greatly increased number of black journalists working in mainstream media.

Yet, Martindale concludes, black and white journalists feel that racist attitudes and practices still permeate the media and "much remains to be done to tell the true story of black Americans." Amen.

One doesn't have to look far to find fresh examples. One striking illustration came recently in a paper that has one of the better records anywhere for its coverage of black people.

On September 7, The Washington Post - possibly one of the more blameless, but far from perfect, on coverage of blacks - premiered its slick new, longplanned and heavily promoted Sunday magazine. The cover story, "Murder, Drugs, and the Rap Singer," was about a New York recording artist and alleged drug dealer facing charges in Washington for the slaying of a rival pusher. Critic at Large Richard Cohen led the issue with a column condoning the refusal by some Washington merchants to admit to their establishments young black men, on the grounds that by race, sex, and age they are likely shoplifter suspects.

For several Sundays thereafter, hundreds of angry readers protested outside the Post building and eventually tossed more than 100,000 copies of the offending publication at its door in a throwback demonstration with the theme, "Take it Back."

It took four weeks, but, on October 5, the Post apologized. Ex-

ecutive editor Ben Bradlee, with an op-ed page article, acknowledged that the two pieces "touched a sensitive nerve in the black community." To borrow a Kerner phrase, it is understandable that the *Post* could have been oblivious to that sensitive nerve before it was touched, but not excusable.

Columnist William Raspberry declared in *The Washington Post* the next day that to the "outraged black readers," the two pieces amounted to "an indictment of young black men and a justification of discrimination against them — a journalistic attack on our sons."

What was missing, he said, was the "all important context" by which the paper could have avoided presenting its image to the readers as "just another powerful white institution that seems not to give a damn about its nonwhite readers."

Raspberry concluded that black readers wanted not to have blacks' faults ignored, nor to have them reported to the exclusion of their virtues. "The demand is not that blacks be painted as paragons," he said, "but that they be painted entire. The readers are right."

The episode well illustrates that there are abundant current examples to support Martindale's points and to raise the question of why a book so important in its concept should waste much of its 200 pages replowing old ground. How useful is it to go back to the early 1950's to document by empirical study what the Kerner Commission and countless conferences, journalism reviews, and other critics have historically bemoaned?

It is by now a given that blacks were practically invisible in newspaper stories — except in the stereotypical roles of athlete, entertainer, and criminal — until the civil rights struggle introduced a fresh stereotype of blacks as marchers and demonstrators.

Though its early chapters take on an appearance of filler rather than useful reporting, this book is redeemed in the end by several significant conclusions.

Martindale notes that during the 1970's news executives favored an emphasis on the need to hire more black journalists, though that was widely agreed to be only a part of the solution.

"A reader could almost come to the conclusion, from studying the professional journalism periodicals during the 1970's," Martindale notes, "that most media executives and journalists had unconsciously concluded that the media's deficiencies in minority coverage could be eliminated if the media could only hire enough minority reporters."

No one knows better what a fallacy that is than the black journalists of conscience who wrestle always with the dilemma of how to advance a career against overwhelming odds while carrying the burden of correcting coverage deficiencies developed over decades by all-white newsrooms.

To hold a still shamefully small corps of black journalists in America's newsrooms responsible for the persistent inadequacies in coverage of black people is the moral equivalent of portraying a long-overdue national holiday honoring Martin Luther King Jr. as a "black" holiday.

Yet we have seen both errors committed repeatedly and unabashedly by media decision-makers of generally unimpeachable integrity.

Certainly not every black reporter or editor is encumbered by the dual obligations, but many bring to their jobs an awareness that "people did not march and go to jail and die in the civil rights movement so that as a black journalist you could spend your time solely promoting your own career by any means necessary," as U.S. Civil Rights Commissioner Mary Frances Berry challenged in the W.E.B. Dubois lecture to the National Association of Black Journalists last August.

The news business is better for

those who do carry the twin responsibilities, but probably not much enhanced by black journalists who would define themselves as "journalists first," thereby muting whatever special perspective they might have brought to their profession.

"Each and every day the best black journalists in the mainstream media are . . . required to put their special knowledge and insights and their perspectives up against the often shallow, deeply held convictions of their editors. They are required to have a broader perspective."

It is especially instructive for the black journalists, who remember a time when women were as scarce in newsrooms as were non-whites, to look around and find how extensively newsrooms have been integrated by sex. The comparison tells much about what news executives can accomplish if they are willing.

Another worrisome development that Martindale stresses is that the news media, still far from attaining its stated goals of minority hiring, has already begun to lose ground.

"Because so few minority reporters who entered the media in the early 1970's have been promoted to middle management jobs," Martindale acknowledges, "many of them became frustrated and left journalism, and bright journalism students realize they will have little opportunity to move to the top."

Here we are now watching the erosion of even the minimal gains made by the media toward realizing America's ideals by helping to improve race relations.

And Martindale has done well to remind us of a message that was urgent in 1968 and is critical today:

"The white press' . . . repeatedly, if unconsciously reflects the biases, the paternalism, the indifference of white America. This may be understandable, but it is

not excusable in an institution that has the mission to inform and educate the whole of society."

Alice Bonner, Nieman Fellow '78, is editor, special projects, with USA TODAY.

The Bugaboo of the Publishing Community

The Journalist's Handbook on Libel and Privacy.

Barbara Dill. The Free Press, 1986. \$19.95.

by Diana M. Daniels

Renata Adler is writing about it, William Tavoulareas and William Westmoreland have sued over it and Synanon has collected on it. If that is not enough, scarcely a month goes by without lawyers and journalists alike holding seminars and conferences to wring their hands about it. Small wonder that libel has become the bugaboo of the publishing community.

For all the talk and litigation on the subject of libel and privacy, little seems to be learned by way of example. As Pogo so sagely noted: "We has [sic] met the enemy and it is us." Reporters, writers, editors and researchers continue to need guidance through the thicket of libel and privacy law which has developed since the celebrated case New York Times v. Sullivan, the genesis of much of modern American libel law. With the standards of liability and damages unpredictable and the costs of litigation in terms of lost man hours incalculable, The Journalist's Handbook on Libel and Privacy should be a welcome addition to any newsroom library.

Barbara Dill, a lawyer with a journalism background, undertakes the awesome task of writing a "comprehensive newsroom handbook on libel and privacy." Her purpose is to render a "guide through troubled waters and hard times and a reference for information and advice on everyday legal problems." Dill draws largely on her experiences as a lawyer advising reporters and editors in seminars held in newsrooms around the country, sponsored by The Mutual Insurance Company of Bermuda on how to prevent libel and privacy suits. And, for the most part, Dill has succeeded in writing a readable, entertaining primer to the law of libel and privacy.

In 251 pages, the book covers many of the issues which arise on a daily basis in the editorial process and is worth reading especially for those in the print media and, in particular, newspapers. Unfortunately for broadcast journalists, Dill does not identify in the same detail the problems unique to broadcasting. Outtakes, ambush interviews, and the television format do not get any play.

Dill covers a range of topics from the general to the specific, including what constitutes actual malice and how to bolster the journalistic process to defeat an actual malice claim, steps that can be taken to buttress defenses to private figure cases and the mystery of recognizing an opinion, enumerating no less than eleven opinion indicators. Dill also examines the four branches of privacy law—false light, intrusion, embarrassing facts, and appropriation.

Particularly helpful is the way in which the author develops what is permitted under the law and where the law is murky. The examples she uses to illustrate various legal issues that have been involved in litigated cases offer the best means for bringing the complexities of the law home to the working journalist. For instance, she takes the reader through the pitfalls in the reporting and editing process in the Sharon v. Time case. Dill also highlights the importance that attaches to the image journalists project of themselves and their attitudes toward people and stories in affecting the outcome of a trial in the Tavoulareas v. Washington Post case. And on often overlooked topics, she includes material on headlines, letters to the editor, editorial/op-ed pages, as well as a number of cartoons which have made it into the courtroom.

By analyzing the different phases of the editorial process — from reporting to editing to publishing, from trespassing to note-taking to headlines — Dill provides practical advice on building in defenses from the very start so as to reduce the risk of suit and, if suit is brought, the risk of liability. As the saying goes, to be forewarned is to be forearmed.

Of the most value, with some minor exception, is the last chapter on questions often asked by journalists. The answers Dill gives to those questions are a mix of what is the law and helpful hints on dealing with issues from "where can suit be brought?" to "is it legal to report the name of a rape victim?"

What may be needed, however, to turn the last chapter from a good chapter into a great chapter is a disclaimer noting that the questions and answers are to an extent geared for smaller newspapers. For example, a number of large newspapers and magazines have significantly different approaches to insurance and policy coverage than are set out in Dill's book.

Another useful section of the book is the appendices, where various state statutes of limitations for bringing libel actions, together with a compilation of shield laws and retraction statutes as they relate to reduction of exposure to damage, are set out. One positive note has hap-

pened since the book was published the Florida legislature recently reduced its four-year statute of limitation on libel actions to two vears.

The book does, however, have a number of shortcomings. For all the emphasis on helping journalists to learn more about libel and privacy law, and on spotting problems and avoiding them, the text is almost devoid of any guidance on how to escape confrontation leading to litigation once an article has been published. As the Iowa Research Project conducted by researchers from the University of Iowa recently concluded, the manner in which postpublication complaints are handled has a substantial effect on the reduction or the increased risk of litigation. It is not enough to have been mindful of the many libel and privacy pitfalls which abound in publication, since ultimately mistakes are sometimes unavoidable.

Dill devotes a brief three paragraphs to corrections, while at the same time going on at length to point out all the difficulties in, for example, determining whether a person is a public figure or whether a statement is an opinion or a fact thus, building the case that mistakes are bound to happen and one had better know how to handle them. And, short of a published correction, the book does not offer much in the way of assistance in identifying serious complaints, in investigating the facts post-publication, or in providing alternatives to a full-blown correction.

No mention is made of use of letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, follow up articles, or clip file corrections, to name but a few options to the straight correction/editor's note.

A further problem with the book is Dill's intermittent insertion of her personal point of view as it relates to some aspect of libel law. Being partisan in favor of the media does not. in and of itself, help the journalist who has to deal with the law as it is interpreted by the courts and juries.

In what must be a holdover from the seminars, Dill's editorializing is out of place in a handbook. For example, in commenting on the branch of privacy law involving embarrassing facts, Dill opines, "I will find it painfully difficult to argue the newsworthiness of the . . . story as published."

In another passage on the same topic, Dill writes "the Supreme Court has not yet addressed the question, but I believe when it does it will protect the right to report history accurately. Nevertheless, I also believe journalists have a responsibility to evaluate historic information about living people for newsworthiness before republishing it."

Also misplaced in a handbook of this sort is the occasional reference to various libel defense lawyers who advised and assisted Dill in the preparation of the book. I daresay few of the journalists for whom the book is written have heard of the lawvers whose names are used to bolster points being made by Dill, all of which could have been made by the author herself. The use of the lawyers' names, in fact, breaks up the flow and readability of the book and leaves the reader wondering why the references are being made in the first place. Dill's acknowledgments at the beginning of the book are certainly adequate in giving recognition to those who helped her.

The short history outlining the development of libel law since New York Times v. Sullivan was refreshing, though somewhat simplistic. But I cannot help questioning its place in a handbook. Does it matter beyond mere academic interest to the working journalist that Justice Hugo Black, joined by Justice Douglas, voting with the majority in New York Times v. Sullivan wrote a separate opinion? Furthermore, there is an added danger in being simplistic when summarizing cases. Sometimes Dill overstates the case for the proposition she is trying to make.

With the law of libel and privacy in continuous evolution, the book qua book is always going to be out of date. Just this last term after the book went to press, the Supreme Court handed down two decisions involving standards of proof and burden of proof which in all likelihood will help the press.

Journalists would have been better served had the handbook been published in the form of a loose-leaf service which could be updated taking into account the changing law.

Another small but annoying aspect of the book is the lack of citation, even in footnote form. Anyone interested in reading the full text of the often unidentified cases would find it rough going.

If thoughtfully used, Dill's book will help journalists carry out their jobs responsibly, and in a way recapture some of the public esteem which has been lost by the press in the last few years. Dill's wisest words are that "truth and accuracy are the best protections there are against libel" and truth and accuracy are what the press should aspire to as ends in and of themselves. Such is the stuff that will preserve the integrity of the editorial process and a free press.

Diana M. Daniels is vice president and counsel of Newsweek.



Libel Litigation: A New Growth Industry

Suing the Press. Libel, the Media, and Power.

Rodney A. Smolla. Oxford University Press, 1986. \$18.95.

by John B. Kuhns

Widely-publicized libel suits of recent years are starting to create a new growth industry — books on the law of defamation. Most purport to be of assistance to legal counsel for one side or the other in such litigation. Suing The Press by Rodney A. Smolla is written for a larger audience.

Unlike most books on defamation law, Smolla hasn't limited his review of recent libel litigation to judicial opinions, but has reviewed court transcripts and placed trials in their historical context. The dry, dull style of most judicial opinions causes one to forget the high drama surrounding major libel litigation in recent decades - drama which Smolla recaptures as he analyzes New York Times Co. v. Sullivan in the context of the civil rights movement, describes Carol Burnett's battle with the National Enquirer, and writes of the feud between Lillian Hellman and Mary McCarthy. His descriptions of these and other trials are fascinating tales of powerful people and powerful news organizations and should be read by anyone with more than a passing interest in journalism.

Suing the Press has another important virtue. By focusing on dozens of specific cases, both Smolla and the reader can draw a number of conclusions about libel law. Although some of Smolla's conclusions are good, one need not agree with them. The evidence is there which enables readers to understand the major libel cases of the last two decades and to determine for themselves whether present libel

law makes any sense.

Certain of Smolla's observations seem inescapable:

Some libel suits don't seem to belong in the courts. Should a jury decide what level of responsibility, if any, General Ariel Sharon shared for the massacre of Palestinians at the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in West Beirut? Should a jury decide whether General Westmoreland participated in a conspiracy to suppress the truth about the actual strength of Communist forces prior to the 1968 Tet offensive? As Smolla writes: "Maybe Westmoreland was right, and Giap wrong. Maybe Westmoreland was right and Dr. Spock, Abbie Hoffman, and Walter Cronkite were wrong. And maybe not. But whoever was right, isn't it clear that this is the stuff of history, of politics, of ideology, and not the stuff of a jury trial?"

Some libel suits seem aimed at suppressing opinion, not correcting false facts. Perhaps the best example of such an attempt was Lillian Hellman's suit against Mary McCarthy, based on McCarthy's statement that she thought Hellman was "tremendously overrated, a bad writer, and dishonest writer . . . I once said in some interview that every word she writes is a lie, including 'and' and 'the.'"

Libel suits can cost an extraordinary amount in legal fees. Smolla provides the following data to support this proposition:

- ABC reportedly spent \$7 million in a suit filed by Synanon.
- CBS has reportedly spent between \$3 million and \$4 million in a suit filed by Colonel Anthony Herbert.
- Estimates of the CBS legal bill in the Westmoreland case range between \$5 million and \$10 million
- William Tavoulareas' legal fees were \$1.8 million in his suit

- against The Washington Post.
- Juries either don't understand or intentionally misapply libel law.
 Two-thirds of the jury judgments in favor of libel plantiffs are reversed on appeal.
- Libel trials seldom resolve issues of truth or falsity.

Against this background, it should be apparent that reform is desperately needed. I would propose reform along the following lines, although these proposals are admittedly controversial. Smolla would reject many of them.

- 1. Suits brought by senior governmental officials based on reports of their official conduct have no place in our judicial system. They involve questions of politics and ideology which aren't the proper subject for juries. We all know that the core value of the First Amendment is free and uninhibited political speech. And vet, how can any of us speak freely about the government activities of General Westmoreland, General Sharon, President Reagan, Senator Kennedy, or Chief Justice Rehnquist if a potential libel suit lurks around the corner?
- 2. The time has come for us to adopt some modification of the British system, and to broaden the court's power to require the losing party to pay legal fees in defamation cases. Too many rich plaintiffs are bringing libel suits against the media for purposes of intimidation even though they have little chance of success. Smolla observes that nearly half of all libel suits are "nuisance" suits that have little or no merit. Smaller media organizations simply can't afford to defend such suits and have no choice but to curtail their reporting. The only way to preserve this critical voice is to prevent this form of economic intimidation.
- 3. The law of defamation should be dramatically simplified. Truth should be the goal in any formulation of libel law, and the present system rarely ascertains truth. Economic damages should be elimi-

nated, except in those rare cases of intentional and knowing falsehood. There should be a simple and inexpensive forum for libel plaintiffs to prove truth, restore their reputations, and set the record straight.

The system could work something like this: An individual who believes he or she has been libeled should request a retraction or correction. If the media prints or broadcasts such a correction, the matter is resolved and no court action is permitted. If the media declines, the individual should go to court and try to prove the falsity of what has been said. The jury would decide the truth or falsity of the statement, and the record would be set straight. The court would have some discretion to require the losing party to pay legal fees. In many cases, the trial would be fairly simple - no public figure test, no actual malice test, and no negligence test. The press usually would not be subject to damage awards and would have an opportunity to recover legal fees when it prevailed.

Critics will argue that the press would behave irresponsibly under such a system, and that it would be unfair to libel plaintiffs. I don't think so. If what the defendant said or printed is proved to be false, a court would have some discretion to require that the defendant pay legal fees, depending on the circumstances. And economic damage would be preserved in cases of intentional and knowing falsehood. This should be ample deterrent for the press. Equally important, the wronged plaintiff's reputation could be vindicated - something the present system doesn't allow since a plaintiff now loses if he proves falsity but fails to prove negligence or actual malice.

In conclusion, I would like to offer a personal observation. It is remarkably easy for those who have rarely published to attack the press for anything short of perfection. Perhaps as more people write about defamation, they will develop a greater understanding of the press.

Richard Smolla criticized the media for its lack of fairness in a number of cases, and yet, his own account of *Tavoulareas* v. *Washington Post* can be faulted on the same basis. For example, he presented Mr. Tavoulareas' version of pre-litigation negotiations, but never presented the *Post's* differing

version of those events. Would anyone suggest that Mr. Smolla deserves a damage award against him for this presumably unintentional omission?

John B. Kuhns, a graduate of Yale Law School, is vice president of personnel, The Washington Post.

The Style of Pyle

Ernie's War: The Best of Ernie Pyle's World War II Dispatches.

Edited, with a Biographical Essay by David Nichols. Random House, 1986. \$19.95.

by Jack Foisie

B y the title it seems just a reissue of Ernie Pyle columns, the best of those written beginning with the Battle of Britain in 1940 and ending with the draft of one found on Pyle's body April 18, 1945, after his death on Iwo Jima from a Japanese sniper's bullet.

But there is much more to this book, including an honest appraisal of Pyle — his weaknesses and strengths — by the young Indiana writer, David Nichols, and a discerning foreword by Studs Terkel, the oral historian.

To those who fought in World War II, or who waited at home for loved ones, Pyle still musters much affection, Nichols writes. The Pyle family home at Dana, Indiana, which contains Pyle memorabilia, is visited by thousands, most of them of Second World War vintage. And in Honolulu there is also a steady flow of people passing by his grave at the Punch Bowl cemetery.

However, it is not only those filled with nostalgia who will read this book. As John Valentine of *The Wall Street Journal* noted on the anniversary of Pyle's death, he is attract-

ing the notice of the current generation, their curiosity perhaps nurtured by the tales of their fathers who marveled at how the skinny, balding middle-aged Pyle "wrote it like it was."

The actor William Windom has performed one-man shows based on Pyle's life and writings to enthusiastic audiences nation-wide. Film rental companies report the 1945 movie, *The Story of G.I. Joe*, based on Pyle coverage and notably non-flag waving (although with some Hollywood blemishes), is still a sought-after film, particularly popular among college students.

I agree with many others that no other correspondent in World War II — including Ernest Hemingway and John Steinbeck — wrote such sensitive descriptions of soldier life in combat.

Pyle introduced a new style of reporting wars. He centered on the enlisted men and the line officers in combat units, seldom on generals or colonels. His captains and sergeants and privates usually were infantrymen, for Pyle had great admiration for the men who were able to be brave despite great fear, who gave their utmost despite physical distress and discomfort, who, when not in combat, chaffed under "rest area" discipline.

As his readership grew and he became immensely influential, Pyle was able to get across to the reading public on the home front how it is that men go forward — often to their death — not for God or country, but because they are determined not to let their buddies down.

This combat bonding is strengthened by undergoing stresses and petty humiliations during basic training, griping together during the boredom and seemingly senseless restrictions of rear area military life, the rough living up front, and the gut ache of fear under shot and shell, and sensing that the fellow sharing the foxhole has a gut ache also.

All this, Pyle came to realize, melds men to do deeds which other people call heroic but they do instinctively — to die to save a buddy.

Probably at no other time in life is there such frequent opportunity for this total unselfishness — to die for another — and it is astonishing how many do not shirk when the moment arises. Throwing one's self on an enemy grenade lobbed into a crowded bunker became commonplace enough so that, toward the end of World War II, the smothering of a grenade blast could not become the sole basis for recommending a posthumous award of the Medal of Honor.

Throughout his two and a half years of war reporting (there was a homefront gap between his London blitz accounts and his going overseas to be with American troops), Pyle was intent on getting across to readers the magnitude of the sacrifice by the fighting men and the altered sense of values thrust upon them.

In one of his columns, Pyle wrote of Sergeant Buck Eversole, a platoon leader who had been in frequent combat for more than a year. Buck was a killer by necessity, but at core a moral man, capable of sensitive feeling. In describing green replacement soldiers, Eversole told Pyle: "I know it ain't my fault they get killed. I do the best I can for them but I've got so I feel like it's me killin' 'em instead of a German. I've got so I feel like a murderer. I hate to look at them when the new ones come in."

It was, as I have mentioned, a new kind of war reporting. A few tried to emulate Pyle, and a good number have tried since then to "concentrate on the GI" in American conflict. No one has yet succeeded as Pyle did.

There are other reasons for this besides the main one: Pyle was a remarkably sensitive fellow, with talent to express his feelings on paper, with a keenness of observation that is an essential tool of the trade, and with a low-key interviewing style. He mingled and listened. His questions were quiet and sensible, not thrusting. He seldom took notes, except for names and addresses, but he remembered what was said. No wonder people felt comfortable around him and opened up to him.

There was another reason for his success. The circumstances were right for someone to explain how combat develops and how it is fought, in terms that home folk can understand. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the country was united in supporting the war. It had to be fought and won. The homefront needed to be assured that ultimately the Americans, with all their grit, would overcome.

Without being a pollyanna about it, Pyle's columns from North Africa began to reflect that belief. After the Tunisian campaign had ended in victory, Pyle wrote a summation to his collection of columns published as a book, Here is Your War: "We are producing at home and we are hardening overseas," Pyle wrote. "Apparently it takes a country like America about two years to become wholly at war. We had to . . . let loose of life as it was, and then live the new life for so long that it finally becomes the normal life for us."

It was a summation that hardly could have fit the later wars, not the Korean War in its early stages, and it certainly never could have been applied to any stage of the Vietnam War.

Those wars were controversial and caused embitterment. There

was little interest in heroes, only in scapegoats.

That seems to be at least a partial explanation why there have not been others writing in Pyle's style, attaining his success.

Another lesser reason for Pyle's accomplishment was the format - a column. He was not responsible, as most correspondents are, for reporting breaking events, although he was capable of doing so. He produced cabled reports as a frontline witness of the American military debacle in Tunisia when, in the first major meeting of German and American forces, two experienced Afrika Korps armored divisions met the American First Armored Division and other American forces and sent them reeling back in complete defeat. The night tank battle at Kasserine Pass was illuminated by spectacular fireworks. The orange tracers of the Americans and the green tracers of the Germans made it seem like a Fourth of July.

Normally, however, Pyle columns appeared ten days to two weeks after he had written them. He would produce a bunch and then spend days with a unit, unobtrusively becoming a trusted figure to the men. Periodically Pyle was depressed when he would return to the same unit for a brief reunion and find so many young friends gone — dead or wounded.

Yet Pyle never became a cynic. He escaped the occupational hazard that afflicts many of us.

In another departure from the usual set of journalism, Pyle never wrote anything critical about anyone, although his columns were anything but goody-goody. In private he agreed that there were "plenty of heels," but his solution was not to publicize "heels."

Pyle took on an aura of saintliness after his untimely death. His last typed column, with his own penciled corrections, was auctioned off with the money going to War bonds. The high bidder bought the manuscript for several million dollars —

astonishing money in those days.

Ernie, who despised sham, would have agreed. That is another reason why this new issue of his writings is worthwhile. Nichols' well-researched and sensitively-written biography of Pyle does not hedge on Pyle's personal problems, nor those of his wife Jerry. They began married life as bohemians. As he progressed in journalism, briefly becoming managing editor of the now defunct Washington Daily News, the gap in their interests widened. Pyle tended to be sickly, and after a while he became a hypochondriac.

To recover from a lingering case of influenza he and Jerry took a trip to the southwest and then also traveled on a freighter. Out of those experiences he became a travel writer, and for the next six years it was his fulltime job for Scripps-Howard. He crossed the American continent thirty-five times by car, visiting every state at least several times. He wrote about unusual people with odd jobs and outlooks. The Pyles also traveled extensively in Central and South America.

Pyle was under contract to provide six columns a week and so it was an arduous and rootless life. It suited him but as biographer Nichols notes: "Life on the road held very little for Jerry whose pleasures - reading, playing the piano, working crossword puzzles - were largely sedentary." They both began to drink, Pyle under control, Jerry to excess. They became divorced, and then remarried. Jerry attempted suicide twice.

This sad and disturbed personal life did not affect the fine and sensitive writing that Pyle later produced; indeed, it makes his accomplishments seem all the more remarkable.

While a soldier-reporter for Stars and Stripes, I knew Pyle in Sicily and Italy. As his reputation grew, so did the hyperbole about him. A Time cover story on Pyle outraged him - no, irritated him, for Pyle was always a person to keep his emotions in check. The magazine portrayed Pyle as stumbling into war, believing himself inferior to other correspondents because of their dash and his own measured approach to the war. Initially, said Time, Pyle was the object of practical jokes played upon him by soldiers whose stories he sought.

If Pyle stumbled into war, so did we all - soldiers, sailors, airmen, correspondents alike. Our initial wretched performance in North Africa demonstrated our innocence and our unpreparedness. Before joining Stars and Stripes, I was in the 701st Tank Destroyer Battalion, attached to the First Armored Division. As "tank destroyers" we were expected with our half-tracks and 75mm cannon to ambush German tanks with 88s which outranged us. We were indeed unprepared.

Pyle was shocked by the horrors of frontline combat, but he soon became the calm and courageous observer of it, and the sensitivity in his writing was exquisite.

His best piece ever, almost everyone agrees, was his account of the affection felt by the men in an infantry company for their commander, Captain Henry Waskow, killed in the mountain fighting near San Pietro, Italy.

"It was at the foot of the mule trail the night they brought Captain Waskow down," Pyle wrote. "The moon was nearly full, and you could see far up the trail, and even part way across the valley. Soldiers made shadows as they walked."

That is not only reporting, it is fine writing.

His plain, unadorned, understated writing continued:

"Then a soldier came and . . . spoke to his dead captain, not in a whisper but awfully tender, and he said: 'I sure am sorry, sir'."

The Washington Daily News, Pyle's former paper, filled all of its tabloid-size front page with the Pyle column in large type, with this precede: "Page one is different today because we thought Ernie Pyle's story would tell you more about the war than headlines that Russians are

35 miles inside Poland, or that Yank fliers are backing up Yugoslavs."

Pyle did suffer from an inferiority complex, as Time said, although I would prefer to describe him as super-modest. The proof lies in the Waskow piece itself. Before sending it off to his editors he showed it to several correspondents, asking if he had gone overboard, and made it too tearful.

Pyle altered war reporting, of course, by concentrating on "the little people," although he never would have used such a patronizing term. He did write about generals on occasion. His three columns on General Omar Bradley, then a relatively unknown corps commander in Sicily. helped to bring this remarkable military man to the American public's attention and assured his high standing with Generals Marshall and Eisenhower, who later elevated him to be the senior commander of troops for D-day in Normandy

During World War II, under the armed services' peacetime promotion system "by the numbers," it is extraordinary how so many men who became great commanders were promoted over the heads of those senior to them - Marshall and Eisenhower being prime examples, as well as Admiral Chester Nimitz.

Pyle's solidarity with the little guy carried through to the end. In his relatively short time covering the Pacific war (the Navy was delighted to get him) Pyle fended off invitations to the big warships and as his initial assignment, chose to be with a small carrier, the USS Cabot. As he explained, "little ships don't get the glory they deserve." However, he soon was back to the infantry, first with the Marines and then with the Army, for he felt more comfortable with the foot-sloggers. That admiration brought him to his death.

I like to remember Pyle at his pixie best when we lived in a correspondent's quarters atop a Naples hill. We called the place the "violent villa of Vessels" after the man who ran it,

Captain Jay Vessels of the Air Corps. Across the street was a field hospital. A nurse we called "Goldilocks" came daily to give Pyle shots for his newest sniffle.

In thanks, Pyle, in his longjohns and olive-drab knit cap, would do a little song-and-dance, the singing ending with the line: "She was just a personal friend, I said a personal friend, of mine-nnnnn!"

Pyle was modest; he was talented. Above all, he was an unusual, delightful fellow.

Jack Foisie, Nieman Fellow '47, retired in 1985 as foreign correspondent for The Los Angeles Times. During World War II Foisie, a soldierreporter for Stars and Stripes, lived

with Pyle and other reporters in correspondent's quarters.

In Ernie Pyle's book, Brave Men, published in 1944. Pyle wrote about Foisie: "In the last war, the Stars and Stripes had many men on its staff who later became prominent in the literary world. It is too early to tell what the various army newspapers in this war will produce but we have a couple of likely candidates in Italy. Soldiers and correspondents both would have cast a willing vote for them . . . One was a reporter; the other a cartoonist. The reporter was Sgt. Jack Foisie The cartoonist was Sgt. Bill Mauldin Both were quiet and earnest; both had genuine talent, and had ephemeral and intuitive ability to express the soldiers' viewpoint."

Three Gentlemen of Japan

Samurai and Silk: The Individual and Japan's Modernization.

Haru M. Reischauer. Harvard University Press, 1986. \$20.

by John Wheeler

W hen Haru M. Reischauer's grandfather, Masayoshi Matsukata, was born into a samurai family in 1835 in the feudal domain of Satsuma at the southern end of Kyushu, the spartan values of the feudal warrior prevailed. Boys were kept separate from girls "to ensure that their virility was not sullied. Even the laundry of boys and men was washed in separate tubs from that for females and hung on separate laundry poles to dry. . . . Brothers and sisters meeting on the street would not speak to one another." Only fifty years later, the feudal order swept away and Japan on its way to becoming a significant world power, Matsukata and his wife, "he dressed in Western formal evening attire, she in high Victorian decolletage," danced the night away with foreign diplomats at Tokyo's fashionable Pavilion of the Deer's Cry. Described by Mrs. Reischauer in Samurai and Silk, this close mimicry of Western customs totally alien to those of Japan produced revulsion among even those taking part. It is nonetheless a poignant moment in Japan's hectic rush to build a modern national state and achieve equality with the West in the years after the Meiji Restoration of 1868 ended the two-and-a-half century rule of the Tokugawa Shogunate.

Samurai and Silk chronicles the reasons behind Japan's modern economic success largely through intimate portrayals of the lives of Mrs. Reischauer's remarkable grandfathers — Matsukata, political leader, nationbuilder, statesman, the father of modern Japan's financial foundations; and Rioichiro Arai, pioneer international businessman, expatriate in New York, private entrepreneur helping to generate the wherewithal for the nation's industrial and military development. "Without the

foundations the one laid," Mrs. Reischauer writes, "the success of the other would have been impossible, but without Arai's sort of entrepreneurship, the statesmanship of Matsukata might have created only an empty shell. Their careers represent the two sides of the coin of modern Japanese economic history."

The result of Mrs. Reischauer's search for "my heritage — my roots in Japan and America," Samurai and Silk provides a personalized view of Japan's recent history and United States-Japan relations. In the process it gives anyone interested in the state of those relations today some valuable food for thought.

Mrs. Reischauer's narrative includes chapters on some of the descendants and relatives of Matsukata and Arai, but it is in essence the story of these two formidable figures. The portrait of Matsukata is the more compelling, despite the author's confessed difficulty of bringing to life someone she had met "only on formal occasions, when he seemed a remote godlike being," a man who "considered himself as belonging more to the nation than to his family" and who "had grown into a venerable and revered statesman a figure in history – long before I was born."

As a bright teenager skilled in martial arts, Matsukata attracted the attention of the progressive Lord Nariakira of Satsuma as well as that of the young clan activists in the movement to restore imperial rule. Satsuma, together with the Choshu clan, played the central role in the overthrow of the Tokugawa Shogunate and the subsequent construction of the imperial Meiji state. Imbued with nationalist fervor fueled by Japan's forced concessions to superior foreign powers after the arrival of Commodore Matthew Perry's black ships in 1853, the samurai rebelsturned-statesmen of Satsuma and Choshu carried out one of history's most sweeping national transformations - all in the name of traditional restoration. Matsukata played increasingly central roles in this dramatic process, from clan officer and member of Satsuma's chief policymaking body, to governor of Hita Prefecture in the new order following the Tokugawa collapse, to national leader in the Meiji government in Toyko.

Finance Minister for some fifteen years and twice Prime Minister. Matsukata, who died in 1924 at 89, survived longer than any of the other original genro or elder statesmen, the group of men who shaped the new Japan in the last three decades of the nineteenth century. His greatest achievements were in the financial area, particularly during the first half of the 1880's when through "a severe program of financial retrenchment, he halted inflation, balanced the budget, reversed the adverse balance of trade, and established a sound monetary policy." He also established a central bank, and, later in the century, put Japan on a gold standard. The drastic policies needed to create a firm economic foundation to fulfill the promise of the 1868 Restoration brought severe depression to the nation. But Matsukata, with the backing of his fellow nation builders and the Emperor, persevered, and by 1885 business was booming and Japan had won new international respect for its achievements. Matsukata's policies were vindicated and an American Minister even compared him to Alexander Hamilton.

Maternal grandfather Arai's beginnings were humbler and wealthier than Matsukata's. His family of silk producers were rich peasants who were prominent as local government officials in a hilly part of the ruling Tokugawa family's territory in present-day Gumma Prefecture north of Tokyo. Unlike the Satsuma samurai Matsukata at the center of power, the young Arai was a "double outsider - a youth with a peasant-commercial background from the shogun's realm." Some such outsiders, frozen out of the new leadership, were attracted to Japanese Christianity which was "fiercely independent of missionary domination and provided an alternative value system to the emperor-centered thought of the Satsuma-Choshu clique." Arai's family converted to Christianity in the late 1870's as did Arai himself some years later.

Arai emigrated to New York in 1876 at the age of 20 to become one of the first Japanese businessmen in the United States. Despite his long years abroad and the gradual Americanization of his family, Arai's sense of national duty was keen. Strongly convinced that he was "entrusted with a patriotic mission to help Japan build itself into a modern nation by earning specie for its industrialization," Arai established a prosperous silk trade. Crossing the Pacific Ocean by ship ninety times, he played an essential role in bridging "the gap in understanding between American manufacturers and the Japanese silk producers, who had little concept of the mechanized industry." Arai's success speaks for itself. As Mrs. Reischauer observes: "During his years in the United States, from 1876 until the 1930's, raw-silk exports financed more than 40 percent of Japan's entire imports of the foreign machinery and raw materials with which Japan built an industrial base for the army and navy that made it a first-class military power and later one of the leading industrial nations in the world."

The success was also hard-won. Many prospective landlords slammed the door in his face before Arai found a boarding house in Brooklyn for "\$5 a week including breakfast." Lumped with Chinese, or "Asiatics" as they were called and reviled as "cunning, treacherous and vicious" sorts who worked long hours for low wages, he and his Japanese friends were constantly jeered. But Arai persevered to become one of the wealthy pillars of the Japanese-American community, living in a large home he built in Old Greenwich, Connecticut, and finding every opportunity for a round of golf.

Mrs. Reischauer's interesting, well-

written biographies of her illustrious grandfathers succeed in bringing to life and personalizing recent Japanese history. Even today, despite the multifarious, complex interaction among Japanese and Americans that characterizes the increasingly interdependent relationship between the two countries; despite the plethora of popular books, articles, and television programs that try to explain Japan's society, economy, and psyche, Japanese are still surprisingly unknown to most Americans as real personalities. Mrs. Reischauer's account of the Matsukatas and Arais takes us beyond collective generalization to the individual actors in a compelling drama of personal and national growth. It also whets our appetite to know more about the Japanese - both past and present in similar depth.

Mrs. Reischauer makes little attempt at analysis in Samurai and Silk but her intimate portraits effectively illustrate the complexity and tension implicit in the huge and rapid transformation attempted by men like Matsukata and Arai. The forces and emotions they sought to shape propelled Japan from feudal dictatorship to mdoern imperial power in a few short decades; they also led the nation to all-out war, defeat, and devastation.

The portrayal of Matsukata is particularly illustrative. Though a farsighted nationbuilder with great financial vision and acumen, he was no democrat. He "viewed with repugnance the development of political parties," the author explains, finding "it difficult to adapt the feudal concepts of his youth to emerging trends toward parliamentary government." Later in her narrative, Mrs. Reischauer states that Matsukata's China policy showed "the relatively enlightened and perspicacious views he held on international affairs." As elucidation, she quotes at length from a statement by Matsukata to Prime Minister Terauchi in 1916 that, while it does chastise Japan's policy of uni-

laterally exploiting China's weakness and isolating Japan from the international community, it also gives a haunting preview of the justification for Japanese aggression on the Asian mainland twenty years later. Matsukata ponders how "Japan, as the leader of the vellow race, can execute her heaven-bestowed duty . . . Japan will become the leader of East Asia, first guarding China and then the other countries of East Asia, gradually letting East Asia govern East Asia and making unnecessary the interference and pressure of the white race."

Matsukata's ruminations on China highlight a central motivation of the two modernizing protagonists of Samurai and Silk, a theme with continuing resonance in U.S.-Japan relations today: the obsession with achieving equality with the powerful nations of the West. Arai wrote in his memoirs that "the greatest moment in my life in America was when word came that the Japanese were victorious in the Russo-Japanese War. Then, all Americans were nice to us." This was in 1905, and, three years after the Anglo-Japanese Alliance marked the first equal treaty between an occidental power and a non-Western nation, confirmed the West's acceptance of Japan as a world power in its own right. Japan's emergence meant the end of such humiliations as the extraterritorial privileges that Western nations enjoyed on Japanese soil until the end of the nineteenth century.

Recognition of Japanese power, however, did not bring the equality for which Japanese like Arai so yearned. Anti-Japanese feeling and talk of the "yellow peril" flared in the United States soon after Japan's victory over Russia had eliminated certain inequalities. By 1924 the American government had declared that as "aliens ineligible for citizenship," Japanese were to be totally barred from immigrating to the United States. We are told that Arai's son Yoneo for "his whole life felt the anxiety of not being accepted

as an equal."

After Japan's defeat in World War II such sensitivities were compounded by guilt and a general revulsion against the nationalist values that had inspired Matsukata and his Meiii colleagues to build the imperial Japanese state. Patriotism became a negative symbol as Japan concentrated on economic and social reconstruction under American tutelage. But as in the times of Matsukata and Arai, the nation once again responded with speed and creativity to formidable challenge, becoming in a few short decades an economic superpower with a GNP second only to the United States among advanced market countries and with the largest capital surplus in the world. Japan was once again the only non-Western member of an exclusive club, this time of the seven industrial democracies that meet at the summit each year to discuss global economic issues.

Mrs. Reischauer ends her book most appropriately with a brief account of the life of the uncle she called Nobu, Nobuhiko Ushiba. A skilled diplomat with an engaging personality, Ushiba set new standards of effectiveness as Japan's Ambassador in Washington in the early 1970's and later as his nation's chief representative for trade negotiations and other external economic affairs.

Drawn to nationalistic expansionism in the prewar days of his youth, Ushiba's patriotism matured into a broad vision of Japan's international responsibilities in cooperation and equal partnership with the United States and its other economic partners. "The uncertain and sometimes timid internationalism of my grandfathers," Mrs. Reischauer writes, "attained full maturity in Nobu's easy participation in world affairs . . . with Nobu I have reached what Japan is today."

Or, perhaps, what Japan can be. Having caught up with the West for the second time in this century, having surpassed even its American conqueror and mentor by certain economic, social, and technological yardsticks. Japan's role model is increasingly itself. Out in front, confident, newly assertive, anxious to end the postwar mentality of contrition and circumspection, yet not quite convinced that it is as rich or strong or influential as the world perceives it, Japan is attempting to define a new national destiny. As this momentous process unfolds, there is plenty of potential for arrogance and chauvinism. There is also the promise of enlightened international leadership that Nobu Ushiba, inspired by some remarkable relatives, so admirably exemplified.

John Wheeler is vice president of the Japan Society. He also has been with Time-Life Books, and he was stationed in Tokyo for four years.

Books in Running Brooks

The Charles. The People's River.

Max Hall. David R. Godine, 1986. \$12.95.

by Ian Menzies

W hat would Harvard be without the Charles? Surely a lesser place. The river gives a particular grace, not only to Harvard University but also to all the cities and towns and institutions that line its banks.

Rivers are like that. They give an enhancing sense of place; a focus to man's additions. They add delight to country settings while humanizing urban spaces. They encourage both play and relaxation; they are both useful and enjoyable and controllable.

There is a fascination to rivers, especially for children, whose free-flowing minds sense the mystery of ever-coursing waters.

Appropriately enough, it was as a child, Max Hall tells us, that he first

became intrigued by the Charles. It was the summer of 1919. He was nine years old and, from his home in Atlanta, Georgia, had come to visit an aunt whose apartment faced the river from the Boston side.

Hall's love affair with the Charles was not a figment of nostalgic childish memories. Not only did he keep a diary - notations say he enjoyed the "Esplanard" and took a walk halfway across the "great Harvard bridge" - but sketches he drew have been reproduced delightfully by the publisher, David R. Godine.

Nor was Max Hall's fascination with rivers limited to the Charles. He has what he terms "a river heritage," derived from his father, a hydrographer with the U.S. Geological Survey, who gained professional acclaim at the turn of the century for his pioneering measurements of southern rivers.

Hall's curiosity about rivers took what he describes as a forward leap when, in 1943, as a correspondent for the Associated Press, he wrote a series of ten articles on the Tennessee Valley Authority; an assignment that called for trips up and down the Tennessee River by boat, automobile, and plane.

By 1960, Maxcy Reddick Hall, after twenty years of newspaper work in Atlanta, New York, and Washington, and a 1949-50 Nieman Fellowship, plus six years with government agencies in Washington, was back in Cambridge as Social Science Editor of Harvard's University Press.

Once again the Charles lay at his front door but not the answers to his many questions as to how it became what it is today - perhaps the only river in the world passing through a densely populated coastal area that has been transformed into a large fresh-water metropolitan lake whose level is lower than high tide in the harbor beyond.

A bit to his surprise, Hall found that if he wanted the answers to his questions, he'd damn well have to do the research himself with the gratefully acknowledged assistance of Rita Barron, executive director of the Charles River Watershed Association, indefatiguable promoter and defender of the river.

First came a 20-page article in Harvard Magazine which was greatly expanded to become the present book. The Charles, The People's River. The second half of the title phrase the author credits to Rita Barron.

This is not just a finely researched, intensely interesting story about a river, handsomely illustrated, but the story of a very unique river -ariver the author feels may be the most shaped, reshaped, and controlled river anywhere in the world, at least at its lower end.

In contrast, the upper reaches of the Charles, following considerable controversy, were left strictly alone, in their natural state, proving that extensive wetlands in fact serve as natural storage reservoirs, reducing the threat of flash flooding.

According to Army Engineers, if 40 percent development had been allowed along the upper reaches of the Charles – as developers sought - it would have necessitated a cost of more than \$100 million for protective dikes and dams. Instead, in 1968, the Corps purchased 3,253 acres of wetlands, plus easements on a thousand more, creating what is known today as Natural Valley Storage, a happy blend of conservation and flood control.

That, Hall tells us, was a first. So were a host of other developments that took place on and alongside the Charles. They ranged from engineering initiatives to recreational conservation to the construction of its successive bridges beginning with the "Great Bridge" between Cambridge and Brighton in 1662. It was the first sizeable bridge ever completed in the Colonies.

The Charles, the longest river wholly within Massachusetts although only 80 miles long - has 20 dams. The most recent one, which extended the Charles Basin a halfmile, was completed just in time to

withstand the blizzard of February 7. 1978, which produced a tide 15 feet above mean low water, and some five feet above normal high tide, equalling the highest Boston tide on record.

The Charles River Dam, in the simplest terms, holds back the ocean's tidal waters from inundating streets and homes in the filled-in Back Bay area. It also prevents the river from flooding that same locale through the use of six enormously powerful pumps, machines capable of moving water from river to harbor at a rate of 8,400 cubic feet per second which is, Hall learned, greater than the average flow of the Merrimack River at Lowell.

But Hall gives us more than mechanics, intriguing as they are, as he describes the history of the river. This book also tells about linkages and the personalities and institutions so linked.

We have noted landscape architects (Frederick Law Olmsted, Charles Eliot, and Arthur Shurcliff); famous institutions (Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology); public spirited citizens (Henry Lee Higginson and James Jackson Storrow) and an outstanding civil engineer, John R. Freeman, who designed the Charles Basin, a project designated as a "National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark."

Hall reminds us, too, that Paul Revere rowed across the river before taking horse to Lexington; that Old Ironsides was launched at the mouth of the Charles; and that the nation's first big cotton mill, marking the start of the American industrial revolution, was built by the river in Waltham, even before the founding of the city of Lowell.

This book is, in part, a snapshot history of America, written, you might say, from the viewpoint of the river, as redesigned by man.

And the legacy of all of this thought, innovation, landscaping, and engineering, as Hall points out, is that the Charles today is a river serving people.

It truly is the "people's river," a festive river, center stage for so many wonderful events, from free concerts at the Hatch Shell to the world's largest one-day regatta. Harvard kicked off its recent 350th anniversary with a musical fanfare by the river. It is a place where people jog, lovers meet, and others rest. It is a place to sail, to canoe and now, as the river becomes cleaner, even a place where one can once more fish and swim.

All this didn't happen without effort, a great deal of effort and, as regards the cleanup, an on-going effort.

Initially both the Charles River Dam and the Esplanade, to say nothing of the early bridges, were vigorously opposed. Yes, even back then, one could hear the familiar cry — "not in my backyard."

Enwrapped in Max Hall's fascinating and lucid story is, I believe, a message for us all. Are we, in our turn, contributing to posterity as did those who gentled the Charles to enrich, for us, the quality of urban life?

Ian Menzies, Nieman Fellow '62, is a former managing editor, associate editor, and columnist of The Boston Globe. He retired in 1985, and is currently a senior fellow at the McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, University of Massachusetts, Boston.

from those that greet us today. It is a simple task to extrapolate what Good writes about and see its current relevance.

He argues that newspaper fiction is a steady barometer of the times, albeit one that is subject to the whims and fancies of novelistic technique. He contends that many who found their careers in journalism were attracted by the role models in novels. He suggests that the public's perceptions of the press were greatly influenced by the characters they saw at work in fictional newspapers.

But, more cogent to the heart of his book is the curious question: Assuming the importance of these novels about newspapers, assuming their popularity, assuming the frequency with which they are written, assuming the natural writing ability of their authors, then why, for goodness sakes, are they usually so bad?

Excellent question — one that eludes an easy answer.

It is true that there are probably more people who long to be Writers (with a capital W) at work on newspaper staffs than in any other location, with the possible exception of college campuses. It is a natural progression; the young would-be author heads out to a newspaper to acquire some "real" knowledge about the world. The reporter learns about fires, floods, famines, and all sorts of human frailties — only to be incapable of realizing this understanding in fictional terms.

Good's study of the fiction that has been produced shows that it is, for the most part, cliché-ridden and filled with stock characters in static situations. Editors are always hard-bitten. Reporters are always ambitious. The newspaper is thrust up against some great evil, which it defeats, usually at the cost of a loss of innocence on the part of the young reporter.

Good demonstrates that the reporter in modern fiction lacks the enduring qualities of, say, the hardboiled detective. Any person who

A Chilling, Curious Question

Acquainted With the Night: The Image of Journalists in American Fiction, 1890-1930.

Howard Good. The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1986. \$15.

by John Katzenbach

n old saw proclaims that in the A top drawer of every working newspaper reporter's desk there is a dog-eared, stained, and bedraggled manuscript of a novel, usually awaiting the final chapter, which the reporter will get to, sometime after covering the latest city commission meeting, three-alarm fire, or suburban slaying. And because these meetings, fires, and murders never end, as all reporters know, but hate to acknowledge, these last chapters seldom get written. So, according to mythology, the novel languishes and the greatness of its reporter-author remains undiscovered amidst the steady pressure of deadlines made and missed, until the once promising writer looks back from the copy desk somewhere, wondering where his talent got up and went off to.

It is precisely this haunting image,

filled with despair, that prompted former newspaperman (and now teacher) Howard Good to expand his doctoral dissertation into the short but valuable book: Acquainted With the Night: The Image of Journalists in American Fiction, 1890-1930. In a brief prologue to his study, Good describes himself alone in the newsroom of The Charlotte Observer electronically wading through the newsfiles, feeling his own writing ability eroding under a constancy of headlines

He writes that he - like many others before him - thought newspaper work was a "backdoor to literature." He was disillusioned to learn that newspaper work is only a backdoor to more newspaper work. Consequently, he reentered the academic world and produced his book. He writes that he selected the period 1890-1930 to dissect because it was considered "the golden age" of American journalism, the era which saw the birth of the modern newspaper we know today. He discovered, as will the reader, that the sensibilities and themes of the novels he studied during that turn of the century era were not much different has studied American literature knows that there are great characters who are detectives, but precious few who are reporters.

And, it seemed that almost every novel the author studied, whether it dated from 1890 to 1930 or to 1980 made the same point about journalism as a profession: it eats up talent and digests ability: if young reporters don't get out at an early age, they will be buried under the demands of the job. Having felt precisely this weight burdening himself, it is natural that Good would emphasize it in his book.

The discoveries that Good makes in this study will, I believe, chill almost any newspaper staff writer with aspirations to become a novelist. The concept that newspapers are a great training ground in the process of life for would-be fiction writers is held sacred in the profession. To debunk it would remove some of the illusions that help carry reporters through life, day-by-day.

Part of the problem, of course, in leaping from reporter to novelist lies in the training one receives in the first place. Reporters are taught to see life in terms of stories, what can, through description and careful juxtaposition of fact and quote, be recreated into a short slice of newspaperese. The novelist's task is radically different, and indeed, it can be argued that the training one gets on a newspaper staff actually defeats the novelist's techniques. The novelist doesn't reduce, he expands. The journalist, ultimately, no matter how many column inches the editor promises, winnows down, paring away the thoughts and emotions that are so integral to the fictional process. The reporter, in the long run, trusts what's in his notebook more than what he remembers.

And, what is most difficult for those who aspire to make the leap from reporter to novelist is coming to understand that what constitutes a "great story" does not in any way automatically re-shape itself into a great book - often not even into a mediocre book.

Even the ballyhooed "new journalism" which sought to employ the techniques of fiction writing to factual writing wasn't really new, nor were the techniques actually the same. In reality, all "new journalism" is is greater license to do away with traditional newspaper forms. And, as most novelists will contend, form is critical to the fictional process. I suspect the majority of successful novelists are slaves to form; they would despair without it.

But what is contradictory or mysterious in all this is the thought that if you scratch most novelists, you will still discover some reporter in a great many of them. The problem, of course, is that the reverse isn't equally true. Scratch most reporters even the ones considered by their newspapers to be "writers" - and vou will rarely discover a novelist.

The most depressing aspect of Good's study is that even those reporters who did make the change were, for the most part, so undistinguished as novelists. And this is a curiosity. Americans thrive on realism in their fiction. Who better equipped to bring realism to them than the reporter turned novelist?

So, why don't they? Again, this is a question without an easy answer.

Another dominant theme running through Good's book is the one that is familiar to almost every newsroom; the concept that newspaper work steals all the ability that the reporter has, churns it up and spits it out in so many column inches daily, only to demand more and more, until the reporter is wasted. In plot after plot of the novels he studied, Good discovered that almost every one of the ambitious young reporterheroes of the works was ultimately forced to move on to another profession - often writing. The idea of reporter burn-out is nothing new. If Hildy Johnson was tired of the business in 1928, so is Harry Bolton (in Philip Caputo's DelCorso's Gallery)

But in this regard, Good argues

that the novels he studied are reflections of the daily reality of the business. And there is great currency in that argument. Acquainted With the Night is the sort of book which ought to stir debate in newsrooms, because ultimately it raises many critical questions that are vital to the business of putting out the news.

John Katzenbach is on leave from The Miami Herald. He is the author of a novel and a work of non-fiction. His third book, a novel titled The Traveler, will be published this winter by G.P. Putnam's Sons.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation

(Required by 39 U.S.C. 3685)

Title of publication: Nieman Reports. Publication no. USPS 430-650. Date of filing 9/30/86. Frequency of issue: quarterly. No. of issues published annually: four. Annual subscription price: \$15. Complete mailing address of known office of publication: One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, Middlesex County. Complete mailing address of the headquarters or general business offices of the publishers: One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. Full names and complete mailing address of publisher and editor: Howard Simons, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138; Tennev B.K. Lehman. One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. Owner: Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University, One Francis Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders: none. The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes has not changed during preceding 12 months. Extent and nature of circulation (first number is average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months, and second is actual number copies of single issue published nearest to filing date): Total number copies: 1550: 1600. Paid circulation, sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales: none; none. Mail subscription: 1145; 1188. Total paid circulation: 1145; 1188. Free distribution by mail, carrier or other means, samples, complimentary, and other free copies: 298; 290. Total distribution: 1443; 1478. Copies not distributed, office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: 107; 122. Return from news agents: none; none. Total: 1550: 1600. I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete: Kettee J. Boling, business manager.

NIEMAN NOTES

- 1939 -

By the time this reaches print, Totty Lyons will have observed her 80th birthday on November 12. We were told that she did not want "a lot of fuss," so a quiet family dinner was planned. However, we feel sure she would enjoy a small flurry of belated greetings to mark the occasion. The address: 9 Kenway Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Totty is the widow of LOUIS M. LYONS, the Nieman curator for twentyfive years.

- 1940 -

OSCAR J. BUTTEDAHL sends sad news from his home in Santa Rosa, California, to inform us of the death of his wife, Hazle, on August 5.

The Buttedahls celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary last November. Earlier in their careers, they were publishers of the weekly Montgomery (California) Village News from 1955 to 1961. Prior to that, the couple owned and operated The Meridian Times, a weekly newspaper near Boise, Idaho. Since Mr. Buttedahl retired from journalism, he has worked in life insurance and investments.

In addition to her husband, Hazle Buttedahl is survived by two daughters and three grandchildren.

To our further regret, Irma Nixon wrote in October to let us know about the death of her husband, GLENN C. NIXON. He died on September 7 of a heart attack at his home in Riverside, Connecticut. He was 78.

Mrs. Nixon said in her note, "We have attended every Nieman reunion. . . Glenn and I had planned a trip to China, Bali, Singapore, Bangkok, and Hong Kong months ago. . . . my cousin is going with me.

"Glenn never wanted to be sick in a hospital or nursing home, and God granted his wish. His three daughters each gave tributes to their father. Barbara, our youngest, is in her last year at Yale Divinity School. She conducted the service in Boise and planned the one in Greenwich."

Glenn Nixon began his career as a writer for *U.S. News* in 1935. During World War II he served in the U.S. Navy and retired as lieutenant commander. He later was rehired by *U.S. News* and became an editor for the merged *U.S. News* & World Report, a position he held for twenty years until retiring ten years ago.

Born in Franksville, Wisconsin, he was a graduate of Simpson College, Iowa, in 1928. He did graduate work at George Washington University.

- 1944 -

As we reported in these columns (Summer, 1985), ROBERT C. LASSETER JR. died February 6, 1985. His Will has included a bequest of \$25,000 to the Nieman Foundation "without restriction, but with the request that it be used in whole or in part with dedication to the memory of the late Louis M. Lyons."

A formal note of deep appreciation from the present Nieman curator, Howard Simons, has been sent to Robert Lasseter's widow, Lida Lee Lasseter. For others who may wish to write, her address: Box 315, Pawley's Island, South Carolina 29585.

- 1948 -

ROBERT SHAPLEN's latest book, Bitter Victory, has been published by Harper and Row.

He first visited Saigon in 1946 for *Newsweek* magazine. He was among the last Americans to leave the city in 1975, with the Communists at its gates. More recently, the authorities in Hanoi permitted him to spend five weeks traveling in Vietnam and a week in Cambodia in the autumn of 1984. *Bitter Victory* is an account of that journey.

Shaplen is also a writer for *The New* Yorker.

- 1953 -

JOHN STROHMEYER is the author of Crisis in Bethlehem, published in October by Adler and Adler. The book traces the decline and fall of the steel industry through the fate of its archetype, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation. Until his retirement, Strohmeyer for 28 years was editor of the Bethlehem (Pennsylvania) Globe-Times.

- 1954 -

RICHARD DUDMAN, chairman of the board, WDEA-AM and WWMJ-FM, Dudman Communications Corp., Ellsworth, Maine, wrote in September:

"Here is the result of a surprise short-term assignment for my old paper. I'd been trying to get the Chinese to let me do the great earthquake story for ten years. Five years after I retired from the [St. Louis] Post-Dispatch, they finally said yes in June. A message from the Chinese Embassy in Washington said I should call them about my trip to China. What trip? They had decided to let foreign reporters into Tangshan for a day or two at a time and suddenly remembered my file of cables and letters. I spent 24 days in Tangshan."

Dudman sent us his special report which appeared in the August 24 Post-Dispatch. He interviewed survivors of the 1976 earthquake, which measured 7.8 on the Richter Scale. Its focal depth was between 7 to 10 miles; shock waves were felt 500 miles in all directions. The death toll of more than 241,000 was not announced by the Chinese authorities until after three years of the trauma.

- 1961 -

JOHN D. POMFRET, a senior vice president of The New York Times Company, has assumed the new corporate responsibility of overseeing the business activities of all Times Company newspapers, according to an item in the September 6 issue of Editor & Publisher.

- 1962 -

GENE ROBERTS, executive editor of The Inquirer, Philadelphia, has been assigned additional corporate responsibilities for Philadelphia Newspapers Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Knight-Ridder, Inc. He succeeds Sam S. McKeel as president of PNI, while retaining his present title and responsibility.

He will have a leadership role in all PNI activities, other than those involved with the Daily News, and in addition to his direct responsibility for the Inquirer's news and editorial departments, he will be responsible for circulation, circulation promotion, marketing, the home delivery communication center, Newspaper in Education program, and for Inquirer operations in New Jersey and suburban Pennsylvania.

Before joining the Inquirer, he served four years as national editor of The New York Times, and was that paper's chief war correspondent in Vietnam.

- 1964 -

ROY REED, professor of journalism at the University of Arkansas and a farmer, is the author of Looking for Hogeye, published recently by the University of Arkansas Press.

Reed tells why, after his years in print journalism, he chose to forsake Washington, New York, and London and make his home in the hills of north Arkansas. He reported for the Arkansas Gazette for eight years and was national and foreign correspondent for The New York Times from 1965 to 1978.

- 1969 -

PAUL HEMPHILL wrote in October: "Somewhere in Florida HBO is filming my novel of '78, Long Gone. It's about bush-league baseball in the 1950's. My second novel, The Sixkiller Chronicles, was honored again as Fiction Prize '85 by the Dixie Council of Authors and Journalists in Georgia.

HARALD PAKENDORF, after seven years as editor of Die Vaderland (Johannesburg, South Africa), was evicted from that position last spring. According to an item in the Financial Mail of June 6, 1986, "Irreconcilable political differences resulted in his dismissal. His rise in Perskor was rapid: In 1970 he went to Salisbury to launch the Rhodesian Financial Gazette. Two years later he was back in the Transvaal to launch Oggenblad, and in 1979, he became editor of Vaderland. . . ."

Perskor has a tradition of giving editors free rein," Pakendorf said. . . . "Anyway, it's their democratic right to fire me if they disagree with what I write." His future plans include some freelance writing under contract, and he hopes to act as a political consultant.

- 1974 -

After 13 days in Lefortovo Prison, NICHOLAS DANILOFF, Moscow correspondent for U.S. News & World Report, was released into the custody of the U.S. Embassy, where he remained for 17 days. At the time, he still faced charges of spying against the Soviet Union.

Daniloff said that he is not a spy and that his activities in the U.S.S.R. were solely journalistic. Both he and the U.S. government said that the charges against him were a frame-up and that the Soviet Union's real intention was to trade him for Gennadi F. Zakharov, a Russian employee of the United Nations who was arrested in New York August 23 on spying charges.

For days Daniloff's arrest and detention were the lead in news. The situation came to bear on international relations, when it was speculated that President Reagan would refuse to arrange a summit meeting with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev as long as Daniloff, a U.S. citizen, was in jail and/or not freed of spy charges.

Concerned for their friend and for the profession of journalism, several of Daniloff's Nieman classmates held a press conference at Nieman Foundation headquarters on September 15 to protest his arrest and detention. The panel, chaired by Nieman curator HOWARD SIMONS, included: NED CLINE, managing editor, Greensboro (N.C.) News & Record; RON GOLLOBIN, investigative reporter, WCVB-TV, Boston; ELLEN GOODMAN, nationally syndicated columnist with The Boston Globe; MORTON KONDRACKE, senior editor, The New Republic; and PATRICIA O'BRIEN, national reporter, Congress, for Knight-Ridder.

After protracted negotiations between Soviet and U.S. officials, Daniloff was released September 12, without having to stand trial. (Zakharov was expelled from the United States on September 30. Subsequently the summit meeting took place in Iceland October 11 and 12.1

After Daniloff gained his freedom and returned to the United States, during his first full day in the country, he met briefly with President Reagan at the White House. The two men then made a joint appearance in the Rose Garden where they were joined by Nancy Reagan; Daniloff's wife, Ruth; and their daughter, Miranda, 23; and their son, Caleb. 16.

Daniloff said again that he thinks the Soviets misjudged the amount of attention his arrest would draw. "I think they were totally surprised by the outcry."

Earlier in the day, Daniloff was given a hearty welcome by his colleagues at the U.S. News & World Report building in Washington.

He was just completing a five-and-ahalf-year assignment as the magazine's Moscow bureau chief when he was arrested August 30 after receiving a package from a longtime Soviet acquaintance.

Daniloff is currently on a one-year leave of absence from U.S. News & World Report and living in Chester, Vermont, where he is writing a book about his experience.

MORTON KONDRACKE, who joined the staff of The New Republic in 1977 as executive editor, left that post early in 1985 to become Washington bureau chief of Newsweek. However, with the October 20, 1986 issue of The New Republic, he rejoined the staff as senior editor and will be that magazine's principal writer on foreign affairs.

- 1975 -

DAVID HAWPE, who has been managing editor/news, at the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times in Kentucky, has been named managing editor. He joined the papers in 1969 as a reporter for the Courier-Journal's Hazard bureau. He was managing editor of that paper until the staffs were combined last December, when he assumed his most recent post.

GUNTER HAAF wrote in August: "Unfortunately my trip to the U.S. had to be cut short in New York, after a pleasant week at the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in Philadelphia, where I spent a wonderful evening with Eileen and RON [Nieman classmatel JAVERS.

"Since July 1, I have been working for GEO magazine (the German equivalent to National Geographic magazine). After pushing along the Science and Medical section of Die Zeit for nine years as a one-man department, I gladly accepted the offer to develop a new series of socalled 'science specials,' which may spawn, if they are successful, a new monthly. The first issue of GEO [under this arrangement] is planned for March, 1987. . . . My good friend and classmate, Nieman Fellow ROBERT FIESS, acts as the editor-in-chief of GEO FRANCE in Paris. Both the French and the German version are doing extremely well, considering the single copy price of nearly \$5. GEO HAMBURG is selling more than 510,000 copies per month; GEO PARIS, being a couple of years younger, already sells 450,000."

Haaf makes his home in Aumuhle, West Germany.

RON JAVERS, editor of Philadelphia magazine, wrote a companion note earlier in the summer about Gunter Haaf's visit. He added, "Gunter wanted you to have this clip about his latest book for Nieman Notes."

Enclosed was an article describing the work, titled The Erogene Factor or How the Educated German Republic Lost Its Innocence by Gunter Haaf and Barbara Hochberg.

The piece continues, "A new discovery will revolutionize medicine. . . . Scientists [have] isolated a new gene segment by routine molecular biology. . . and obtained a polypeptide from the bacteria. . . . The genetically manipulated bacteria has produced a human sexual pheromone whose effect compared to a normal perfume is like a Ferrari compared to a bicycle. The genetic element producing the sensational polypeptide has been christened the 'erogene'. . . . One thing is certain: the identification of the erogene heralds a revolution in research on human sexual transmitter substances."

At the close of the article, there is a hand-written notation: "The book is fiction! A hoax!" indicating that science writers do not always take themselves seriously.

- 1978 -

FRANK SUTHERLAND, former managing editor of the Hattiesburg (Mississippil American, has been named executive editor of the Jackson (Tennessee) Sun, it was announced by the Gannett Company. The Sun became a seven-day newspaper on August 30, when it started publishing on Saturdays.

- 1979 -

MICHAEL MCIVOR, Moscow correspondent for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, has as his translator a young woman, Irina Melnikova, who has worked for CBC for several years. On October 3 she was arrested by police and briefly detained as she escorted a visitor toward the network's bureau. When the translator and the visitor walked back toward the office, several police officers appeared and identified themselves as members of the criminal investigation department. The translator, along with the visitor, was placed in the back of a black Volga sedan and taken to a police station for questioning, McIvor related. "They said to her, 'Haven't you heard of the Daniloff case?" McIvor said. "She was a very frightened young woman when she was released and came back into the office."

In Ottawa, the external affairs minister, Joe Clark, said he had demanded an explanation of the incident from the Soviet ambassador in Ottawa. He also asked for a report from the Canadian Embassy in Moscow. Clark told reporters, "I have no explanation. We have no details. But we are deeply concerned and we want to have full information as quickly as possible."

Like many Western correspondents, McIvor has exercised additional caution when meeting Russians since the arrest in September of his fellow Fellow, Nicholas Daniloff ('74)

- 1980 -

MICHAEL I. KIRK and Elizabeth Anne Arledge were wed on October 25 at St. Andrew's Episcopal Church in Wellesley, Massachusetts. Janet Wu was the matron of honor; Kirk's Nieman classmate, WILLIAM GRANT, was the best man.

The bride is the daughter of Roone Arledge, president of ABC News and the group president of ABC News and Sports. She is the daughter also of Mrs. Arthur J. Spring of Ossining, New York, and Islamorada, Florida.

The bridegroom, whose previous marriage ended in divorce, is a son of John Kirk of Boise, Idaho, and the late Mrs. Kirk. His father is a public-relations manager for the Mountain Bell Telephone Company in Boise.

Michael Kirk is the senior producer for Frontline, a documentary series telecast by the Public Broadcasting Service originating in Boston. The bride is a producer in Boston for the series.

- 1981 -

MASAYUKI IKEDA wrote in October that his work "as reporter/editor of English news and programs of Radio Japan [NHK] has become busier year after year. This spring, I went to Indonesia to make a special program on Japan's technical assistance in Asia. . . . Nowadays, I'm involved in a project of Radio Japan to reinforce its Japanese and English service for North America, using a Canadian relay station. Our one-hour program can be heard daily from 6:30 to 7:30 a.m. EST.

"The major purpose of the program is to provide a compact roundup of events in Japan for the Japanese in the United States and Canada. At the same time, we are planning to gradually improve the English part to make it become a good channel for helping acquaint Americans with this country."

- 1984 -

JACQUELINE THOMAS, editorial editor with the Detroit Free Press, has been named associate editor. She is second in command of the editorial page under Joe Stroud, editor of the Free Press. Before moving to Detroit last April, she was an

associate editor of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times in Kentucky. Previously, for eleven years, she was a reporter at the Chicago Sun-Times.

- 1985 -

ZWELAKHE SISULU, editor of The New Nation, Johannesburg, learned while he was in detention in July, that he had won a coveted international journalism award. He was announced the 1985 winner of the Swedish Journalist Association's annual scholarship. This is believed to be the first time the award has been made to a non-Swede. At the time, Sisulu's lawyers were preparing an urgent court application to challenge his detention. Since then, he has been released and is currently back at work, as editor of the new newspaper, The New Nation.

- 1986 -

CARMEN FIELDS, formerly a reporter with WNEV-TV, Boston, has been named professor of journalism at Northeastern University, Boston. She also has been an assistant city editor of The Boston Globe.

BARRY SHLACTER, correspondent for the Associated Press, is the producer of a documentary drama about the African adventures of Beryl Markham, a writer, aviator, and contemporary of Isaak Dinesen. The film is the brainchild of Barry and his wife Amrita. It was photographed on location in Kenya and was broadcast over national public television stations in October.

- 1987 -

MALGORZATA NIEZABITOWSKA is the author of Remnants: The Last Jews of Poland published by Friendly Press. The book is a collaboration between Niezabitowska and her photographer husband, Tomasz Tomaszewski, both non-Jews. For five years they traveled around Poland and interviewed Jewish people, many of whom were the last Jews still alive in their cities or villages. Excerpts from the book appeared in the September issue of National Geographic magazine.

An exhibit of photographs from the book traveled recently throughout Poland. "It was enormously popular," Niezabitowska said. "During four weeks in Warsaw, twelve thousand people came to see it. They were standing in line to get in. There was a visitor's book and there were more than sixty pages of names, and the comments were extremely favorable. . . . People only said that it is sad that there are not more Jews to feel good about this." Ms. Niezabitowska is a member of the editorial board of the Catholic Review in Warsaw.

Every now and then, Nieman Fellows will write in surprise and dismay that they do not see more news about their class in the magazine. Our response always is that we rely on Fellows to keep us informed of their doings and, of course, their changes of address. Also, we glean our reading material constantly for the mention of Nieman alumni/ae. However, there are no substitutes for personal notes. Let this be an exhortation to mail carriers and especially those who use their services!

T.B.K.L.

La Prensa

continued from page 12

censorship, threats, persecution, the state of emergency, and other conditions make it impossible to say in my own country, and what I believe it is my obligation to denounce. And I am saying it here, in the name of the people of Nicaragua, condemned to total silence and to bearing all of the arbitrary measures which the regime wants to impose on us.

In this gathering of graduates, professors, students, and friends of liberty, I feel, more than ever, a militant defender of the freedom which has vanished from my land, but which must be reconquered at all cost.

I thankfully accept the great honor you have conferred upon us. I accept it in the name of all the workers and writers for La Prensa who have accompanied us with such lovalty and such firmness. I accept this award in the name of the editorial writer who signs his editorial; the reporter who, in full knowledge that we have been infiltrated, pursues a news story that makes the regime uncomfortable; the workers in all our departments who are harrassed by the secret police, and who were told that to work for La Prensa was to be a counterrevolutionary. I accept it in the name of the newspaper vendors who were discriminated against for hawking La Prensa on street corners. and in the name of the five reporters who have been imprisoned by the Sandinista regime, and who have had to go into exile for having worked for La Prensa. And I also receive it in the name of my husband who gave his blood for freedom, and of thousands of other Nicaraguans, who also are fighting for freedom.

Once again, together with them, and while standing before you. I want to renew my obligation, and my commitment to a free press. I repeat, this hard task fell upon my frail shoulders at the death of my husband, and I confess that I was not prepared. I was always convinced that we must fight and give our support to those who believe that mankind, and all peoples, were born to live in liberty, and that liberty can only be suppressed temporarily, and must return some day.

I want to end by declaring that I have much faith in God that Nicaragua will soon bring joy and prestige to all Central America. For "sooner than later," as my husband Pedro Joaquin Chamorro Cardenal used to say, Nicaragua will once again be a republic. Many thanks!

(Translated by Maria Iglesias.)



NIEMAN REPORTS ONE FRANCIS AVENUE

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138

Second-class postage paid at Boston, MA and additional entries